

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, May 9, 1986

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 7, 1986.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Friday, May 9, 1986.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We place before You, gracious God, the concerns and wonders and fears and hopes of our lives. Forgive us as needful, comfort us and bless us and may Your loving spirit be ever with us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 737. An act for the relief of Ms. Chang Ai Bae;

H.R. 1207. An act to award a special gold medal to the family of Harry Chapin; and

H. Con. Res. 329. Concurrent resolution welcoming Natan (Anatoly) Shcharansky to the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1874. An act to authorize quality educational programs for deaf individuals, to foster improved educational programs for deaf individuals throughout the United States, to reenact and codify certain provisions of law relating to the education of the deaf, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO ROY B. BERRY OF CLINTON, KY

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in tribute to a longtime dear friend of mine, Roy B. Berry of Clinton, KY, who died April 3 at Murray-Calloway County Hospital in Murray, KY.

Roy Berry was active during his 86 years until the very end.

I attended his funeral and burial in Clinton on April 5.

Rev. Steve Stone, pastor of Clinton's First United Methodist Church, spoke to a large crowd at both the funeral and burial ceremonies, telling the relatives and friends of Roy Berry of the many ways he touched thousands of lives during his lifetime.

Roy Berry was a great man. He was successful as the longtime owner and operator of R.B. Berry & Sons Stockyard in Clinton and as a farmer and landowner in Hickman County, KY.

Roy Berry was a leader at and a generous contributor to his Methodist Church in Clinton. He was active in community affairs and for several years was chairman of the Hickman County Democratic Party.

Among those on the front row at his funeral were former Kentucky Lt. Gov. Harry Lee Waterfield and his wife Laura of Frankfort, KY. Governor and Mrs. Waterfield for many years lived at Clinton, KY, and were very close to and fond of Roy Berry and his lovely wife Elizabeth—who preceded Roy in death.

This Member of Congress was very fond of Roy Berry. He was my active supporter each time I've been a candidate for public office since 1967. In fact, when I ran at age 29 (in 1967) for State senator, Roy Berry was one of my cochairmen in Hickman County.

Roy Berry is survived by one daughter, Mrs. Mary Sue McKendree of Clinton; two sons, Jerry Berry of Route 5, Murray, and Jimmy Berry of Clinton; one brother, Moss Berry of Arlington; one sister, Mrs. Ann Glaser of Dallas, TX; 9 grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren.

My wife Carol and I join with the many friends of this outstanding Kentuckian in expressing our sympathy to the family of Roy Berry. He will be missed by all of us.

DESIGNATION OF HON. JIM WRIGHT TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS UNTIL MAY 13, 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker.

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 7, 1986.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until May 13, 1986.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUBBARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have not taken the floor on this very privileged and highly privileged permission that the House for quite a number of years, as a custom, has given to various individual Members of this very numerous House in order to more extensively proclaim their views, participate in the issues confronting the House.

I have not taken advantage of this great privilege for about 6 weeks, the reason being that the last time that I did address the House, it was to advise my colleagues of my continued and sustained concern about the well-being, rather the threat to the well-being, and the dangers hovering over the heads of some 2,000 of our military, mostly, if not all, airborne, that we have, in company with about 500 Fiji Islanders, 500 Colombians and small contingents of perhaps a dozen or so French and British, as peacekeepers in the Sinai.

I have been asking this since the resolution, which was a mandate from the Congress for the first time in the history of the Congress mandating a troop deployment, and that is the consideration and debate of that resolution in the House was sometime around December 12, 1981; and the record will show that as an individual Member present, and there were just a handful, a score or so present on the floor, I was the one to raise the questions that to this day remain unanswered.

Since then the group was formed, the motions were followed of doing it under and in the name of the United Nations though it is really the United States. The United States is putting up 100 percent of the money.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Let me recall to my colleagues briefly a summary of the events that led to the congressional action: In December, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in a rather quick fashion, presented for floor action in a period of time in which the House was ready to terminate that particular session, a matter that was explained to us as a request from President Reagan in deference to a suggestion and promised activity on the part of his predecessor, President Jimmy Carter, who had written a letter after the Camp David agreements but which was not part of the coterie of side memoranda, codicils, and the like that usually accompany these types of agreements, and, naturally, because the agreement known as the Camp David agreement is between Israel and Egypt, and the United States is not a party signatory.

However, there must have been some doubts expressed by both parties after the agreement was announced so that a letter was drafted and sent in the name of President Carter to the then Egyptian leader, Mr. Sadat, and the then Israeli leader, Mr. Begin, advising that President Carter would seek the formation of a peacekeeping group in order to ensure that there would be some backing of this Camp David agreement.

On its face, it was to me rather strange that President Reagan would ask the Congress to do something that had been initiated by President Carter, since, from the very beginning, he had excoriated Carter for every single thing, including carbuncles, fallen arches, and even to this day.

□ 1115

So that when I saw that presented that particular afternoon, and there being present only some 16 or 17 Members at the most, and most of those being members of the committee that had the business on hand, and that was the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I then read the report accompanying the resolution or bill, and I could not believe it; first, because I had been extremely concerned about the rather nebulous mission that the President had outlined for the Marine contingent that subsequently was announced for Lebanon.

I have been sensitive since I came to Congress and long before the sequela of wars. The reason is that ever since before I ever dreamed I would be in such a place as the Congress, much less in active politics, which is something I have said on several occasions had never been planned or intended by me, but ever since the Korean conflict, and my recollection vividly as if it were today of those fellow San Antonians that volunteered, that went over in great numbers, fought, or imprisoned in Communist prisons in mainland China, languished in those

prisons, and attempts made to brainwash them, and the preponderant majority of those citizens being of that particular ethnic group that we call Mexican-American back home, and not one of those captured ever, ever turncoated. And the newspapers had story after story about how many American prisoners of war had been brainwashed or they were charged with having been brainwashed.

Some of those who had gone over had been members of the Scout troop that I had been Scoutmaster of, right after the war, in 1946 and 1947. And when they came back, they sought me out, and I began to see the anamoly. Of course, everybody forgets, because even what happened last year is ancient history today. The way we live, the events are so telescoped that who remembers the shooting down of the commercial airliner not too long ago or the basic reasons why it had been shot down. Who remembers now the 241 marines who died, murdered needlessly because of the headstrong, abdurate, self-willed Commander in Chief who willfully, not for 14 hours, not for 14 days, not for 14 weeks, but for 14 months overlooked and callously disregarded the unanimous advice of the chief military experts we have, the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Now, with that situation not having happened at the time, but with the experiences still vivid all during the Vietnam war and having been sort of a burr under the saddle for those in power, including my near neighbor and great friend and great leader from Texas—I think that history will show that from a domestic standpoint, probably one of the greatest Presidents we will ever have had, Lyndon Johnson. I know that I was a bother, because I was the one and the only voice in this Congress who all through that period was voicing my opinion that it was unconstitutional for a President to impress an unwilling conscript to serve in an undeclared war outside of the continental United States. It still remains an unaddressed issue.

In fact, the record will show it is not what I am saying now, that when the act permitting the drafting of these unwilling conscripts was up for renewal in 1967, I was the one who took this floor. I was the one who offered the amendment. I could not even get 17 Members to stand up to get a rollcall. But in 1971, when the act was up for renewal again, and I presented the same amendment, I then obtained 151 Members to go along with the amendment.

So what I am saying is that, like everything else in a democracy, unless we reach and penetrate the level of consciousness, either among our citizens or among ourselves, we tend to get lost in the bramble patch of collateral issues that besiege us and plague

and confront us, a plethora of them every day.

But we have to set some priorities. And my whole complaint has been in the last 10 years that we have maintained a perversion of priorities. We have become perverted in our priorities. We will send \$8 billion to some foreign country so that they can have low interest 40-year loans at 1 and 3 percent, while we deny our rural folks even a 9-percent loan so that they can construct a sewage system. That is a perversion of priorities if ever I have seen it.

So the same thing happens on this other level. Who at this time is even remembering that we have 2,000 or thereabout of our troops in the Sinai? What is their mission? What are they supposed to do? This is the question I ask.

They are not peacekeepers. They are hostages. They are there as hostages. And with the situation as deteriorated as it is now in that part of the world, and ever since our compelling the Egyptian airliner to land in Italy where our soldiers there almost got to the shooting point with the Italian soldiers, the mood in Egypt has been strongly anti-American.

So one can imagine after the bombing of Libya what the Arab world feels, because it is now seen as an overt, aggressive action for the first time on the part of our country against an Arabic nation.

We can dismiss Qadhafi as a nut. We can dismiss him as a flibbertigibbet. But the truth is that he is the leader of that nation, that he has shown no mean expertise, even in diplomacy.

For example, when have we had it reported around here that, to the great distress of our CIA and our State Department, Qadhafi brought about a mutual aid agreement with Morocco and its leader, the Sultan of Morocco, Hassan II, where Morocco and Libya had not been on that kind of amicable agreement for years? As of August 13, 1984, there is this mutual aid agreement between Morocco and Libya, despite all of the efforts that our CIA, that our State Department did to prevent it. It happened.

Now that means to me that there is more going on, and that the activities of a nut and that bombs are no substitute for brains. But Mr. Reagan, as I have said many times, not only here on the floor, but back home where I pass review before the citizens who vote for me, I have said that President Reagan has chosen to lust after that false bitch goddess of war. He is drunk with the sense of military power.

□ 1125

And military power can only do so much for certain stated purposes that almost always must be clearly and coherently stated. We are not going to

bomb communism out of existence anywhere, including Central America. Our military approach, which has been the choice of President Reagan from the beginning, clearly has not worked in the smallest country in the New World, in El Salvador, where, without any attempt to follow a collective approach, where we would exert our last remaining vestige of moral suasive leverage with our neighbors, and with the very organization that we helped found, the Organization of American States, President Reagan has never opted, from the beginning.

His first Secretary of State was talking like our Secretary of Defense. He said, "I draw the line in El Salvador, and if necessary, we will go to the source of the evil," referring to Cuba.

Well, we have. We have put in \$4 billion plus. We have had some of our soldiers dying already in El Salvador, and we are no closer to a resolution in El Salvador, Duarte notwithstanding, than we were 5½ years ago. Clearly these activities are bankrupt. There is no such thing as a policy, so that we must consider the fact that incrementally the potential hazard for activities of those that we would designate as terrorists to do great harm in the Sinai is there every day. As I am speaking today, that potential is there. I have begged, I have requested my colleagues to review. In the first place, I raised the fundamental issue on December 12, 1981, as the record will reflect.

What were the purposes of these people when and if the multinational peacekeeping group was formed?

And it was some time later—we never got a report about that—but it was not until I made an inquiry of the Library of Congress research service that I found that, sure enough, we had 2,000, and that was the limit that we stipulated in the resolution, mostly airborne, if not all. We at first persuaded the President of Colombia to lend us 1,000 Colombian soldiers, but then they had a lot of trouble and mischief last year, so they recalled 500 of them to protect the Presidential palace in Colombia, and they have 500 now. And then we have 500 Fiji Islanders. We have about a dozen or so French, a dozen or so British. And that is it. They do not have armor. They do not have aircraft.

What does that mean? It means they are highly vulnerable to an attack by any particularly trained and organized group. A company-sized group, with the right kind of equipment, can do great mischief, and our people, our soldiers are gravely exposed.

I think that ought to be the concern of those of us in this Congress that mandated. We ought to review. What is their mission now? Well, what was it then?

The only answer I could get was that President Reagan wanted us to do this

because he wanted to respect the wishes of President Carter's promise in the letter he had sent.

Now, when had the Congress mandated the deployment directly of troops? I asked that. The members of the committee could not answer, even though they said that during discussion in committee that question had been asked. And, finally, it was decided—and I was finally informed—that, no, it was unprecedented, as I thought it was.

The next question: Why is the Armed Services Committee not referring this, referred to also as a copartner in the legislation? No answer was forthcoming other than that no protest or no particular request had been forthcoming from the Armed Services Committee.

I commented and antagonized the then chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who was a close personal friend of mine; he became very angry with me. I said, "Well, if they had as little notice as we have, then there is no reason to expect the Armed Services Committee to have interposed."

But it seems to me that it is still proper to at least get some input from the Armed Services Committee that should have a better review from the military standpoint.

You are not sending a football team. This is what I used to tell President Reagan on the floor:

Mr. President, you are not the Gipper, you are not sending a football team to Beirut, you have got military and you have got fighting men, you have got marines. They are not politicians, they are not diplomats, they cannot be peacekeepers if at the same time you say they are in there to shore up the Gemayel regime, because the Gemayel regime is one of four factions, so if you are going into that kind of fight, you are not a peacekeeper, you are taking sides, and if you are militarily vulnerable, you are asking for these men to suffer serious bodily harm or death or both.

And there was no satisfaction to me.

Now, I never have been one to come around and say, "I told you so." I think we learn or should learn from mistakes. But President Reagan does not seem to show that he has at all. And this is why I am concerned, because I think the danger is so great that we can be more embarrassed in one blow in the Sinai than any kind of terroristic attack that can be forthcoming anywhere else. I think that either the Commander in Chief, who is supposed to be looking out for troops—but I will never feel that President Reagan gives a tinker's darn, because I remember those 14 months and how frustrating it was to get up here and say, "Mr. President, what is the mission of those marines in Beirut?"

I wrote a letter to the President in the very beginning, in 1982. And, of course, this President is the first of six that I have had the great privilege of

serving with since I have been a Member of this House who does not reply to a Congressman's letter. So I did not expect an answer, and I did not get one. But later and subsequently, in answering a reporter's question, he said they were there as peacekeepers and also to shore up the Gemayel regime which was considered a friend.

Well, to me, if the Joint Chiefs of Staff were saying, "Mr. President, we advise against it because you are asking the military to be in an area of great hostility with a potential for hostile action, in which we are like sitting ducks," I would expect the Commander in Chief to at least give some thought. This President did not. And he cannot deny that the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously advised against that deployment under those circumstances.

It is just unbelievable. Yet it is true. And I have learned, ever since I did enter into the field of politics, that power does mighty strange things to people's minds. I think that the fact that the President has not hesitated to either be so grossly misinformed or so deliberately attempting to deceive that it is a continuing embarrassment to our country throughout the world.

I now refer to his course of action in which he has publicly made many statements and then will come out with a statement such as appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 23, of this year, front page, righthand column lead, "Reagan, Angered, Denies His Policy Aims at Latin War."

"An 'outright falsehood.'" In interview, he also voices his opposition to granting Marcos any immunity.

What he was referring to in this headline was that he was maintaining that he had no intent of using any kind of military action against the Nicaraguan regime, which is popularly called the Sandinista regime.

I will include for the RECORD a more complete account of the New York Times article:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1986]

REAGAN, ANGERED, DENIES HIS POLICY AIMS AT LATIN WAR

(By Gerald M. Boyd)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—President Reagan says some opponents of aid to the Nicaraguan rebels have engaged in "scurrilous" attacks on him and in outright falsehoods exceeding the bounds of fairness.

In an interview Friday with The New York Times, Mr. Reagan displayed rare anger and his voice shook with emotion as he characterized some of the language used in the House of Representatives before his request for \$100 million in aid was defeated on Thursday 222 to 210.

Although the President declined to be specific, he appeared to be talking about the Democratic leadership of the House, including Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.

RESENTFUL OF PERSONAL ATTACKS

The President said opponents "hungry for victory" had made "flat declarations" that his policy was aimed at sending troops against Nicaragua.

"I am not impugning the motives at all," he said, "but some of the opponents of our program engaged in some of the most scurrilous, personal attacks against me, for example, the most dishonest use of distortions and outright falsehoods that I have heard in a legislative battle."

On domestic politics, Mr. Reagan said he intended to involve himself deeply in the Congressional elections this year, traveling and speaking in support of Republican candidates. He said he planned "to do everything I can do on behalf of our candidates and everything that I am asked to do."

LAW TO TAKE "ITS COURSE"

On the disclosures of documents showing that Ferdinand E. Marcos might have amassed a fortune during his 20-year rule, Mr. Reagan said he did not plan to grant immunity to the former Philippine leader for violations of American law.

The law should take "its course," he said, although he added that he did not want to engage in "hearsay or gossip" in assessing whether reports about corruption were true.

Aside from his burst of anger over the House debate on the Nicaraguan aid issue, Mr. Reagan seemed relaxed during the 30-minute session in an Oval Office decorated with spring flowers.

He himself was appealing for private help less than 2 years ago when the Congress attached a rider to one of the bills prohibiting the President from using any of the funds appropriated for the CIA and its attempts in the assassination attempts of the Nicaraguan leaders in the direct military aid to the so-called Contras that were marauding alongside and in the Nicaraguan border, killing peasants, women, children, raping women. And he was on the front page of the paper saying, "Well, I think that private individuals who want to do it * * *." So he backed the retired general who had been in command in Korea when Carter had to transfer him because of the statements he was making of a political nature when he was commander of the troops in South Korea, American troops, and who is, like Mr. Reagan, an ideologue.

You say, "communism," and immediately it is like triggering them, like giving them a hot foot.

Well, we need more than that at this time in this country.

The President was advocating what? He was advocating this general and his group and other groups to raise moneys, arms, all of which have been raised, all the way from recoilless rifles to cannon, to helicopters, all through private donations, all of those in violation of the Logan Act.

What is more shameful for our country is that the President is on record as being a violator of law and order. The World Court, the Tribunal, the International Tribunal of Justice, has adjudicated the complaints in Nicaragua, initiated 3 years or more ago

when, through the CIA, we were bombing their harbors, mining their harbors, attempting to blow up their public buildings, attempting to assassinate some of their leaders. Nicaragua appealed to the World Court. We appealed and answered. The World Court deliberated, found us guilty of gross violations of aggression against what we ourselves were proclaiming to the world was an accepted government, because we still had a duly accepted, documented and with-portfolio Ambassador in Managua from the United States. And all the while we were saying to the world, "We have our official representative," recognizing the fact that that is the official regime in Nicaragua, we were trying to destroy them.

Now, we just cannot have it both ways. We do not have world opinion supporting us. We have terrorized that part of the world. But fear is the only thing that is brought about by this kind of force, naked, raw force. And if people fear long enough, they will fight. And woe to us when that point is reached, because we are totally unprepared, we cannot stand up to the world and say that we will bomb everybody we do not like or that we are trying to prove something.

□ 1140

It just will not work. It has not worked thus far and it certainly will not work any longer in the future.

Bombs cannot be substituted for brains. What we need is an assertion of leadership from our leaders, real leadership, constructive and creative leadership.

In a world that has radically changed, we have in the mind of the President the world of 1946 and 1947. With respect to Latin America, we have a President that has Calvin Coolidge's concept, the last President to send the Marines into Nicaragua. We occupied them there for 13 years so that we could install the regime that finally crumbled all around our ears in 1979.

I placed in the RECORD the white paper that the Secretary of State for Calvin Coolidge issued in an attempt to rationalize the sending of the Marines. I published it in the RECORD. I dug it out. In it he was saying that we have got to stem the exportation of Mexican Bolshevism in Latin America. So that Mexico in 1929 was the Cuba that we so much talk about and sometimes fear, most of the time hate, and do not know what to do with and have not. As a result, we have made leaders out of men in that part of the world who were never considered much more than third rate. We have made them.

I will give you an example. In 1981 when General Haig as Secretary of State drew the line, it was going to be in El Salvador. Remember, it was 1981. The so-called Sandinistas were still

not an elected group of leaders. It was a quadrumvirate. It was a junta that had about one or two priests, one or two Marxist-Leninists, whatever you want to call them, and one or two moderates, whatever you want to call them. They had not consolidated anything. They had kicked out Somoza. They had defeated the national guard. Their economy was in shambles, and it was still fresh.

Mr. Haig decides that he is going to play the old divide and conquer politics that we had been following before 1929 and up to 1929 in Latin America.

So what does he do? He knows Honduras is the poorest country there. He knows that it is owned, run and operated by United Fruit, which is what the fuss is all about, if you want to know the truth, like it was in Guatemala in 1954 when we knocked out Colonel Arbenz in Guatemala. He quit when some of the aircraft hired by the CIA, mercenary American pilots by the CIA, but paid for by United Fruit. They bombed Guatemala City.

Colonel Arbenz says, "I would rather leave than see innocent children bombed," and he left. Where did he go? He went to Cuba.

But in the meanwhile, General Haig decides that he is not going to send American troops. This is before we decided we would make Honduras a training ground and before we really occupied Honduras, as we are now. We are actually occupying Honduras. We are no different than the Russians are in Afghanistan at this time in Central America, only in degree, and that is that Afghanistan is right next to Russia, like Mexico is to us and sooner or later we are going to have to address that dilemma; but unfortunately, after it blows up, instead of anticipating as some of us have been trying to do for 15 years.

But in any event, General Haig is going to be the big wizard, so he persuades whom? Why, those big military junta leaders in Argentina who were abducting thousands of Argentinians, knocking them off, putting them in a plane and dropping them over the sea because they were dissidents. He gets them to loan him some soldiers to bring to Honduras to try to destabilize the Sandinistas.

Well, lo and behold, all that did was kind of reinforce the military junta in Argentina that, boy, they were good enough to go over and take the Falklands, as they felt they owned them, and of course that brought Maggie Thatcher and the fellow tory, Mr. Reagan, and we had to make a choice and we did, as perhaps there was no other thing to do.

We helped Britain very much, overtly, covertly and in every other way; but that antagonized the Argentinians, so that just the year before last, that the generals were kicked out, the

leading group of these generals who were supposed to be the most anti-Castro people in the whole word were in Havana, Cuba, toasting Fidel Castro.

Now, does that mean that Castro was such a great politician, such a great diplomat that he could turn around these enemies? No. It was our folly. It was our stupidity. It was our continued and sustained condescending, insulting, and ignorant view of the countries that destiny says we must share the future with and who for the past 15 to 20 years now outnumber us in total count by about some 75 or 80 million people and who are not going to be constrained.

We talk about the American hegemony. Well, there is no way that we are going to have enough troops without calling in the Reserves, without maybe having a little draft called eventually, if the President continues and he is insistent on doing it, that will directly involve ourselves in an invasion in Nicaragua and if he wishes to knock out physically that government, that is the only way it is going to be done.

But when it is, what are we going to do about El Salvador, the smallest country? What are we going to do about Guatemala, which at present has a leader—who has done what? The newly elected president has just convoked a meeting of all the heads, including the Sandinistas, to get together to seek a peaceful solution.

Their first advice is, "Look, United States, get your troops out. We don't want bombs. We don't want rifles. We want to take care of this."

What did Nicaragua do in February? It got together with Costa Rica, despite our serious opposition, and they signed a treaty between Costa Rica and Nicaragua, forming a joint commission to resolve their differences along the border.

That has angered the State Department so much that they reprimanded the Costa Rican leaders, and which further convinced them.

We have militarized or attempted to militarize Costa Rica. Costa Rica is the only country south of our border that never bothered to have an army. Now we have Green Berets and everything else trying to train for one; but despite that, the leaders saw fit to sit down and discuss with the Nicaraguan leaders whatever differences they had.

They were going to do that just a couple of weeks ago with Honduras. You can imagine how happy our leaders are about that.

But the President of Guatemala has convoked this meeting of all these heads of States of the Central American States.

Now, if he stays in power long enough, like Duarte, Duarte is empowered by the grace of our having muffled the military who are still in control and the radical right representing

those vested landholders who did not hesitate in 1932 to kill 30,000 Salvadorans then, but the world was not as small as it is today and they could get away with it, and they did.

Now, 14 families owning, controlling that whole country, half of them sent all their capital over to Miami. From there, they have been shipping arms and shipping out hit men and everybody else. We have had a murderous expedition, including the murder of Archbishop Romero in El Salvador. The CIA was with the murderers of Archbishop Romero.

And the five American nuns, who thinks of that now?

What are we doing right now in El Salvador? We have given the Huey night seeing attack helicopters doing the same thing the Russians are doing in Afghanistan, hovering over these innocent peasants, shooting them down without any distinction.

In Guatemala we are also resorting to the Vietnam tactics of these preserved hamlets, safeguarding, shifting entire populations. Sure, they are rural populations, but these are populations that have lived in those lands for centuries, for decades, and we have now uprooted them and have compelled them to go to what the Salvadoran Army would consider a safe haven.

But it is our arms, they are not Russian rifles, they are not Russian helicopters, they are not Russian bombs and bayonets.

As I reported here 3 years ago, in Guatemala has anybody ever charged that whatever there is considered a leftist has imported guns from Cuba, Russian or any other Communist source? No.

Yet, the Bishop of Chiapas told me 3 years ago in December of the horrors there. He was trying to have a refugee program for help for 20,000 of the poorest of the poor in the world, the Indians in the mountains, that the Guatemalan Army has committed genocide with American bayonets, ripping open the bellies of 6-month old Marxist-Leninists? That is what we are condoning. This is all done in the name of what? Anticommunism that the United States says they must swear to.

War is a horrible thing. We have been fortunate that we have escaped the real horror. Civil wars are much worse. When we talk about a civil war, which is what these things are in Central America, we are talking about father against son, brother against brother, daughter against mother, uncle against nephew, and nobody can imagine because our own Civil War which was horrible and up until World War I was the most brutal of all wars, those who remember their grandfathers talking about it might have some dim idea about it, but this is what is going on there.

We are identified with all the forces of retrogression. I am not surprised. President Reagan represents retrogression. They talk about a Reagan revolution. It is a counterrevolution. He has attempted to do away with every single housing program that this country has put in place, the Congresses for 40 and 44 years—to do what? To provide shelter for the poor in our country. The President for 2 years has asked us to eliminate every one of what we call assisted housing programs in my district where I saw what targeting education programs do.

□ 1155

In 1964, I was the coauthor of the National Economic Development Act, known as the War Against Poverty. I was the author of most of one title, half of another, and what were those? Work, study, neighborhood youth, all employment programs, so that kids could stay in high school.

In my district at that time, among the Mexican-American ethnic minority, which is now not really a minority but was then, the dropout rate was 76 percent in high school. In a matter of a decade, mostly with the help of these programs, if not totally, that was reversed completely, where we now have 18 and even an unacceptable 20, but in the last 3 years my district, from 2,000 to 2,300 young men, young ladies, highly motivated, academically competent, have not been able to stay in or go into or are being compelled to drop out of the community college, 95 percent from this group, because Mr. Reagan has cut back. The student loan program alone is almost wrecked at this moment.

The Congress has had to compel safeguarding what is left, and for that we are accused of being spenders or budget busters, while the real budget buster, Mr. Reagan's discretionary budget, has increased 750 percent in 2 years. It coincided with the cutoff of the money to the CIA for the Contras, because the money has been going but it has been going in a different way. It does not have to be accounted for because the President uses his discretionary funding. And the man who says the Congress is overspending has had his own discretionary spending increased 750 percent, and not one Member here have I heard get up, except myself, and protest that. It is wrong. It is sinful. It is a crime against the people, in the greatest interest of the greatest number.

I am asked, "Why is it that you have not supported, and you have the lowest support?"

When the President presents me, as other Presidents have, with any kind of a program that is beneficial to the greatest interest of the greatest number, he will not have to lobby me. I will be right there. I have yet to re-

ceive such a recommendation from President Reagan.

Of course, I was not going to go along with his tax giveaway in 1981. That is the reason we have the monstrous deficit. A \$750 billion tax write-off for whom? For the richest people and corporations in this country, \$750 billion. That is not spendthrift? That is not irresponsibility? What a perversion in our ability to determine what is a spending or a true economy from a false economy.

To compound that, the Congress, indeed, has been most disappointing. The fact remains that if we continue to fail to understand what it is the civil wars are to the south of us, if we continue, as President Reagan does, with a General Custer mentality—as my colleagues know, General Custer was the one who was proud of the fact that if he made a Custer decision, that was it. You know what happened to him. President Reagan is no different.

I have said all of this back home as well as here, but I think we need to be reminded that the danger of this false leadership to the lives and well being of some of our elite of our troops, airborne, continues very great. Up to now, the Congress, which did an unprecedented thing when it mandated that, they could rationalize by saying the President requested it. Ironically, most Americans did not even know until the disaster in Newfoundland at Gander last December, when almost a whole company-size group of that military on duty was killed in an accident involving what? An airline that the Department of Defense had continued and still does, mind you, contract even though at one point when I was speaking about it I had one of my colleagues from Michigan report that that airline had had a near catastrophe right there in his home town, and that the Defense Department was not interested in doing anything.

When I wrote a letter to the Defense Department, I had a reply from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Procurement. I put that letter in the *RECORD*, because it is unbelievable. I also sent a message to the President. I knew he would not answer it, but I sent it anyway, and said, "Mr. President, for the good of the troops you are supposed to be looking out for, take \$450 million from that multibillion dollar discretionary fund you have and use military aircraft for military purposes."

The Defense Department tells me that is what they are paying each year for this purpose in commercial flights, but what are these commercial companies? These are all companies that are formed ad hoc for that purpose. They are put together in order to get that very lucrative Army contract.

I have spoken with pilots and with flight attendants that quit because they knew their lives were in danger.

They could see that it was deficient and they quit. I got their messages.

But what was his answer? The Secretary said, "We are looking into it, but we are going to continue, and we see no reason why we should not."

I might tell you this, because I asked the question. I said, "What are you going to do in case you have an eventuality in which you have a war situation?" It is astounding. He says, "Even in war, we intend to use 90 percent of the transportation of our troops in private craft."

So what did I say? I said, "Then the only way you use military craft is like you did in Vietnam, and I protested then to President Johnson: Only when the men come back in body sacks." Then is when they use a military craft. They will use a military craft to ship equipment, cannon, and whatnot, but not live and kicking soldiers who ought to have the assurance that they are going to be transported as safely as it is humanly possible to be transported.

Who remembers the Gander disaster now? Yes, the Congress had some committees that had hearings and they brought some testimony and showed that the Arrow Airlines was bad, and the Air Force said, "We will suspend temporarily," but I want to announce to my colleagues, they are in business today. What do we want to wait for? What more do we want than the official spokesman for the Defense Department saying, "We do not care. That is the way we are going to do it."

What was the reason he gave me in the letter? One, it saves money principally. And second, that small component of craft which is used in training will give us valuable experience in case of war. It is all in his letter. If that is not Alice-in-Wonderland gobbledegook, I do not know what is.

So I appealed to my colleagues, particularly those I have written to that have responsibilities in the committee, that they initiate a review, at least ask questions, about the continuing purpose of the mission of these men in the Sinai. They are in peril.

□ 1205

I pray to the Lord Almighty every morning and every evening and they are in my prayers. I recall with great anguish the case of the Marines in Lebanon, and I just feel that I would be greatly remiss if I did not speak out. I have used strong language.

But I believe, like the great abolitionist, Garrison, that I will speak, sure, as harsh as truth and as uncompromising as justice, for if I am rebutted and if I am shown to be wrong, I will take this same forum, admit to it as best as I can the error of my thinking or actions. But until then, I say it is the height of irresponsibility to ignore these fellow Americans.

Let us just for the moment visualize an attack on this contingent. Let us say, through some fortuitous cause only members of the Fiji Island contingent or Colombia contingent get hurt. What are we going to do? Are we going to say well, it is too bad. Or if we do not know exactly what type of a nameless group did the attacking, who are we going to bomb? Are we going to send more troops, and if so what will be their purpose?

The legislation approved in 1981 limited that contingent to no more than 2,000. Now I asked this question, I said "Well, you are supposed to be there for the purposes of peacekeeping, but keeping the peace between whom?" Between two allies, or erstwhile allies, Egypt and Israel.

Suppose that Israel accuses Egypt of violating. What are we going to do, send troops into Egypt or what?

Suppose Egypt complains that Israel has violated, are we going to send troops into Israel, and what is the purpose? What is the mission? What is the military mission?

You are not sending civilians. You are not asking the United Nations to patrol or watch the peace. You are specifying in this legislation that they must be active duty military, meaning prepared for what? For a military purpose. Well, what is it?

If they do confront a hostile military action, what have they got going for them? No armor, no aircraft. They have nothing. Indeed, they are hostages. That is what they are.

The only difference between this and the Tehran case is that our folks could not do anything about it because they were kept imprisoned in the middle of Tehran in the American Embassy. And then there were less than 100. But over here we have got 2,000 military plus 500 plus 500. You have got 3,000 plus, and with no clear, stated and coherent military purpose.

But we have said since the Korean war that when you do call in the military, the military, trained, able, competent to perform along with their expertise, must have a clearly defined mission or purpose. That has not happened in the postwar period.

I had been a student ever since the 1947 Defense Reorganization Act. Though I never dreamed I would be in the Congress, I certainly was not in politics, but I was interested from statutory and what not. My predecessor had been the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, and I remember I was in the State Senate, and in later, subsequent years, and sent a resolution memorializing Congress that we ought to do justice by trying to correct some of the injustices in the 1958 compensation reform or Pay Reform Act, and particularly with respect to the pension. So, as an aside remark, I asked my predecessor if he

could tell me what was being done by the Congress to review the 1947 Defense Reorganization Act. I had been very careful to note that in the change from the old War Department, Secretary of War, to the Defense Department, that a very elaborate system was set up, but which in the light of post-World War II active shooting phase was unrealistic, that we needed continual oversight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan in three instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee.
Mr. DE LA GARZA.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 1 through June 7, 1986, as "National Theatre Week";

S.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution designating the week of May 26, 1986, through June 1, 1986, as "Older Americans Melanoma/Skin Cancer Detection and Prevention Week";

S.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 11 through May 17, 1986, as "Senior Center Week";

S.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution to designate the month of May 1986, as "National Birds of Prey Month";

S.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution prohibiting the sale to Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles and related defense services; and

S.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning May 18, 1986, as "National Digestive Diseases Awareness Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 12, 1986, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3465. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of budget authority withheld pursuant to the rescission proposals submitted by the President in his third special message for fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685; to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3466. A letter from the Executive Director, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting a report on the corporation's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1985, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3467. A letter from the Secretary, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's compliance with the laws relating to open meetings on agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act) during calendar year 1985, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3468. A letter from the Secretary, the Commission of Fine Arts, transmitting a report on the Commission's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar years 1984 and 1985, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on the Government Operations.

3469. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3470. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Urban Mass Transportation Administration Quarterly Report for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1985, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1603(h)(1); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3471. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Urban Mass Transportation Administration Quarterly Report for the first quarter of fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1603(h)(1); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4745. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to sexual abuse; with an amendment (Rept. 99-594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

(Submitted May 9, 1986)

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration of H.R.

4574; H.R. 4574 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Committees on Agriculture, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4708; H.R. 4708 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4750; H.R. 4750 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PENNY (for himself, Mr. BEDELL, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 4799. A bill to condition certain loans under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act upon a requirement that States establish procedures for mediating farm loans made by Federal entities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WRIGHT (for himself, Mr.

ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. HEFTLE of Hawaii, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LUKE, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BONKER, Mr. MICA, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. MANTON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BIAGI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 4800. A bill to enhance the competitiveness of American industry; and for other purposes; referred jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, Agriculture, and Energy and Commerce for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of those committees pursuant to paragraphs (v), (i), (d), (g), (a), and (h) of clause 1 of rule X, respectively.

By Mr. AUCOIN:

H. Res. 454. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Japan should grant the United States semiconductor industry free access to the Japanese semiconductor market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4122: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 4191: Mr. DENNY SMITH.

H.R. 4488: Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. MONSON, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 4696: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. EARLY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ST GERMAIN.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.J. Res. 590: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. EARLY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

345. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the commission of the city of Coral Gables, FL, relative to the Senate tax reform bill; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COCA-COLA CELEBRATES 100 YEARS

HON. ED JENKINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Atlanta, GA, is awash in Coca-Cola this week—not just in the figurative sense as it always is, but in the literal sense. The Coca-Cola Co., its employees, the 24,000 Coca-Cola bottlers and their employees are celebrating the 100th birthday of Coca-Cola in its birthplace.

One hundred years ago today, Dr. John Pemberton hauled a jug of the syrupy liquid he had mixed up in a three-legged brass pot in his backyard down to the soda fountain at Jacob's Pharmacy at Five Points where he mixed one glass with ice water and another with soda water. The carbonated version at 5 cents a glass won the taste test. Frank Robinson, Pemberton's bookkeeper and partner, is credited with having given the brew its name and having chosen the Spencerian script we all know as the logo and trademark of Coca-Cola.

Alas, Dr. Pemberton died 2 years later without really realizing what he had created. Having a common business problem of cash-flow, he sold shares of his Coca-Cola business to several investors, one of them another Atlanta pharmacist, Asa G. Candler. Candler managed to become sole proprietor of Coca-Cola by 1891 with a total cost of \$2,300.

From the Candler acquisition until today, the history of Coca-Cola presents itself as a case study for advertising and marketing. Candler put the logo on anything people would see, and where it would fit, a suggestion to drink it. Candler took Coca-Cola from the soda fountains of Atlanta to every State and territory in the United States by 1895, but not without first incorporating his company and registering the logo trademark.

With soda fountain sales booming at more than \$100,000 annually, Candler accepted a proposition in 1899 from two Chattanooga, TN men for exclusive rights to bottle Coca-Cola and sell it throughout the country. Benjamin F. Thomas and Joseph B. Whitehead quickly realized they did not have the capital to implement their rights and formulated what is now Coca-Cola's independent bottlers network by selling perpetual contracts and exclusive territories in which to distribute to local entrepreneurs across the United States.

When a group of businessmen led by Ernest Woodruff of the Trust Co. of Georgia bought the Coca-Cola Co. from Candler in 1919 for \$25 million, the company entered another expansion phase, going abroad with its bottling operations. From the first 379 independent bottlers in the first 10 years, Coca-Cola's bottling operation has grown to 24,000,

and the Coca-Cola Co. invited them and their 325,000 employees to Atlanta this week.

Robert W. Woodruff, who was elected president of Coca-Cola 4 years after his father's group bought the company, envisioned Coca-Cola's worldwide availability and translated that vision into reality watching over its expansion for almost six decades. He set up a foreign sales department in 1926, which became the Coca-Cola Export Corp. in 1930. When World War II could have proven a setback, Woodruff saw it as a chance to permeate the European market by putting Coca-Cola in the hands of U.S. servicemen "whatever it costs the company."

The Coca-Cola overseas operations developed into a worldwide network so resourceful in providing contacts and information on foreign policy that a native Georgian seeking insight on foreign policy used that Coca-Cola in-house state department as a training ground in his bid for President of the United States in 1976. When President Jimmy Carter opened the trading doors to China, Coca-Cola was right behind him.

Although Woodruff retired as chairman in 1956, he effectively still controlled the company from a board of directors for almost two decades through the 1960's, when new products with names other than Coca-Cola emerged.

Wall Street called Coca-Cola the "sleeping giant" of the 1970's, but the worldwide structure which leaped into the 1980's drew enough attention to propel Coca-Cola from the business page to the front page. Not only did 13 new American drink products line the shelves, but company executives diversified, acquiring Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc., and made a daring move to change the formula of Coca-Cola. What they found was that no matter what the new wave of consumer taste-testing had told them, all the previous years of indoctrination of the soft-drinking public had created a fiercely loyal constituency. Never let it be said that the Coca-Cola Co. doesn't give the consumers what they want, and it did, returning the old formula as Coca-Cola Classic, but also keeping the new Coke.

Coca-Cola not only leaped into the 1980's but literally leaped off the face of the Earth with its technology to dispense carbonated beverages in the weightless atmosphere of a spaceship. Somewhere, no doubt, within the research walls of the Coca-Cola Co., the technology is being developed or already has been developed to set up the first independent bottler in a space station. The marketing department's strategy surely must be safely locked away in anticipation of that day, since the company must live up to its own promotional material—"When you don't see a Coca-Cola sign, you have passed the borders of civilization." After all, that's the way it is, Coke, that is.

We have been conditioned to expect Coca-Cola to take a leap, and if it stumbles, to see

it right itself in a gracefully profitable manner. If we can order its products in 155 countries in 80 languages, why not expect to take it along with us when we begin to inhabit space and other parts of the universe? What else should we expect from the company who wanted and did teach the world to sing and bought the world a Coke?

FRANK DROZAK ON AMERICA'S MERCHANT MARINE FLEET

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, few citizens realize the vital role that the merchant vessel plays in defending America and her allies abroad. There is simply no alternative to tankers and merchant vessels for transporting vital supplies to crisis locations, or for supporting deployments like the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean off Libya.

However, as Frank Drozak, of the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department, notes in the following Letter to the Editor in the Washington Times, the Congress and the Reagan administration have not been willing to take the steps now to ensure that the U.S. flag fleet is up to the task of defending our vital interests.

Our vulnerability is very real: For example, according to Mr. Drozak, we only have 143 useful petroleum tankers in the U.S. flag fleet, available for use in a crisis. The Soviet Union and her allies have available almost 300 attack submarines for sinking tankers. In 1942, Nazi Germany only had 14 U-boats available for sinking Allied vessels, but they managed to torpedo 450 of our ships in only 7 months. A 1980's reenactment of the Battle of the Atlantic could have devastating consequences. Accordingly, we should heed Mr. Drozak's warnings.

[From the Washington Times, May 8, 1986]

MERCHANT MARINE VITAL TO U.S.

Your misguided, one-sided April 30 editorial "Saving our oil industry" might have been more appropriately titled "Destroying our merchant marine," an action for which *The Washington Times* seems to have a penchant.

The U.S.-flag tankers that carry Alaska North Slope oil are part of the nation's domestic merchant marine. Although you have often editorialized in favor of a strong national security posture, you defy your own logic when you advocate export of ANS oil.

According to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Sealift will bear the brunt of the workload in deployment, reinforcement, and resupply efforts . . . in any major overseas deployment. Ships from the U.S. Merchant Marine represent the single largest domestic source of this sealift. Militarily useful petroleum

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor. Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

tankers in the U.S.-flag merchant fleet number 143. Most of these tankers are involved in U.S. coastal trade."

Although *The Timers* is apparently unaware of the national security value of a viable merchant marine, our principal adversary, the Soviet Union, is acutely aware of those factors.

According to the Chief of Naval Operations, "The Soviet Union has carefully directed the growth of its merchant fleet, not allowing purely commercial pressures of modern trade to dictate its composition."

"As a result, the Soviets today possess one of the few major merchant fleets which can perform either a peacetime commercial mission or satisfy military logistics requirements effectively and efficiently should a conflict arise. This has been achieved by accepting some economic disadvantages in exchange for functional versatility."

In addition, your simplistic economic arguments ignore several important realities. For instance, the federal, state, and local taxes paid by the U.S. companies which own and operate those tankers, and the crewmembers working on them, will be lost if ANS oil is exported, thus contributing to the U.S. deficit. Also, the revenues earned from the sale of ANS oil would merely be transferred to other foreign producers from whom we would have to import oil to replace the losses associated with ANS exports. The tankers which carry those imports would be foreign-flag so the nation's trade deficit would worsen while the United States, rather than Japan, would increase its dependence on energy from the war-torn Middle East.

Further, although ANS exports might prevent Japan from developing Siberian oil fields, the Soviets would likely develop them on their own as they did with the gas pipelines to Western Europe when they were deprived of access to U.S. and Western technology. When those Siberian fields are developed, the cost-sensitive Japanese economy would import from the U.S.S.R. in any event.

FRANK DROZAK,
President, Maritime Trades
Department, AFL-CIO, Washington.

IT'S TIME FOR A SUPERFUND COMPROMISE

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk about the Superfund Program. Despite all of the talk, however, the facts remain unchanged. It has now been over 7 months since authority for the Superfund Program expired last September. It has been over 3 months since conferees were appointed to resolve the differences between the House and Senate passed reauthorization bills. In the past 7 months, the Environmental Protection Agency has been forced to severely cut back its efforts to clean up hazardous waste sites which are endangering the health and safety of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the time for talk is past. It is time for action. It is time for us to enact legislation that will provide a comprehensive 5-year reauthorization of Superfund that will enable

the Environmental Protection Agency to get on with its job of protecting the public.

With that goal in mind, I commend to my colleagues' attention the following editorial which appeared in the May 7, 1986 edition of *Newsday*.

[From *Newsday*, May 7, 1986]

IT'S TIME FOR A SUPERFUND COMPROMISE

At long last, Congress seems to be making some progress on a compromise bill to extend and expand the Superfund program for cleaning up hazardous wastes. But die-hard environmentalists and their friends in the House seem intent on shooting down any agreement that's not entirely to their liking.

The original Superfund program called for \$1.6 billion in spending over five years. It expired Oct. 1, but a temporary extension remains in effect through this month.

Last year, the House passed a \$10-billion, five-year program; the Senate opted for \$7.5 billion. After months of haggling without any apparent movement, Senate conferees recently proposed an \$8.5-billion plan. House conferees led by Reps. Norman Lent (R-East Rockaway) and John Dingell (D-Mich.) countered last week with a \$9-billion proposal.

But instead of halting this progress, spokesman for environmental groups accused the House conferees of making "back-room deals." Daniel Becker of Environmental Action even suggested that the House proposal "jeopardizes the health of millions of Americans," while Leslie Dach of the National Audubon Society said it "damages the chances of passing any Superfund bill this year."

If anything jeopardizes final passage by Congress of strong legislation that would be acceptable to President Ronald Reagan or at least have enough support to override a veto, it's the environmentalists' refusal to consider any modifications of the bill the House approved last year.

Both the Senate and House negotiating proposals deal only with the programmatic aspects of Superfund. Another set of conferees is supposed to concern itself with the funding mechanisms, on which the two houses differ sharply. That effort has barely begun, largely because Senate Finance Committee members have been tied up with tax revision. But without some kind of agreement on the nature of the program, there'll be little incentive to work out of the complex and controversial funding arrangements.

All the Superfund proposals currently before Congress represent vast improvements over the original program. And every day that passes before Superfund is reauthorized means the Environmental Protection Agency falls further behind on the cleanup.

COMPENSATED FOR PAST INJURY

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today the House will be a forum of last resort for Mr. Joe Herring of Wellington, TX—a citizen whose livelihood was irrevocably changed by the actions of a Federal Government agency more than 10 years ago.

Mr. Herring has patiently waited for some sort of restitution and in that connection I had introduced H.R. 1260 over 1 year ago. But sadly my bill will only provide monetary compensation to Mr. Herring. There is nothing we can do to alleviate the injury he and his family have suffered through actions of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration—and I am talking about the injury of losing one's farm and home, and all the heritage behind it.

In 1968, Mr. Herring received an operating loan in the amount of \$17,300 from the FmHA in Hillsboro, TX. Mr. Herring's loan, the balance on which was about \$5,500, was foreclosed on April 1, 1975. He lost his farm which secured the loan and had been in his family since the 1890's.

At the foreclosure sale, there were only two bidders for the Herring farm: The FmHA county supervisor and a friend of the county supervisor's who had been told of the upcoming sale through previous contact with the county supervisor.

According to USDA's inspector general, the county supervisor had told the Texas FmHA State director that: (1) Mr. Herring failed to account for security for the loan; (2) Mr. Herring refused to make loan payments; and (3) Mr. Herring had no assets other than the real estate securing the loan. All three representations by the county supervisor were patently false. But the State director—not knowing anything to contrary—accepted the report of his county supervisor and ordered a foreclosure on the Herring farm.

The Herring farm was sold to the county supervisor's real estate friend for the grand sum of \$5,600. Mr. Herring received a refund after satisfaction of his meager FmHA debt in the amount of \$68.12. The county supervisor's real estate acquaintance turned around and sold the farm in the following month for \$96,000.

The USDA inspector general was incensed at this series of transactions and approached the U.S. attorney in Texas for purposes of prosecution—but sadly the statute of limitations had run out on Mr. Herring.

But at this point it must be mentioned that although USDA agreed there had been a grave injustice done to Mr. Herring—the Department has no legal authority to provide monetary relief for injuries in which there are no infirmities.

It is my understanding that the USDA's favorable report on my bill had languished for quite some time over at the Office of Management and Budget, and throughout this time the USDA leadership had continued to maintain the unique position that Mr. Herring had been the victim of administrative impropriety and should get some relief—relief the USDA feels it has no authority to provide.

Over the years, Mr. Herring's family farm has passed through several hands so we cannot restore to him what was his birthright. But we can do right by this man and provide him some money that is justly his. And that is all H.R. 1260 is designed to do.

As for the Hillsboro County Supervisor and his real estate friend—I have no knowledge of their subsequent situation. I do know, however, that both of them have broken the Lord's

commandment that "You shall not covet your neighbor's house. * * *" And there is but one judge who can relieve them of their transgression.

CHILD CARE—A BETTER ALTERNATIVE

HON. DAN COATS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, today the gentlelady from Connecticut, Mrs. JOHNSON, has introduced the Child Care Act of 1986, a bill to help low-income families in need of child care assistance. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this legislation because I believe it is a giant step in the right direction.

I do not want to see the Federal Government influencing families' decisions to place children in day care. This is too important and too sensitive a decision for the Federal Government to be guiding with its large and clumsy hand.

I believe that we are seeing in our society the ill-effects of underestimating the family. One aspect of this phenomenon is the lack of emphasis placed on parental care of children. It is not enough that a child be fed, clothed, sheltered, and educated. As child development specialists have told the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, children have to be cared for by people who are just crazy about them. Children's notions of their own worth depend primarily upon the irrational, unqualified, and absolutely permanent devotion of the adults who care for them. The quality of this attachment will affect them for the rest of their lives.

Therefore, the decision to put a child into the care of an adult who is not his parent or family member for most of his waking hours is indeed a delicate and important one. I would not wish to find myself in the position of influencing that decision.

Yet, we know that many families do not have much choice about who takes care of their children. Many low-income single-parent and two-parent families have no choice but day care, and have no day care alternative other than that offered by the title XX funded day care center.

At the same time, we also know that the largest source of Federal funds for the day care, larger than all other sources combined, is the dependent care tax credit; and we know that about two-thirds of the money from that credit goes to families with above-average incomes.

This is a situation which needs to be changed. The Federal Government is now in the position of offering large incentives to middle- and upper-income families to use day care, but gives low-income families, very little help and very few alternatives. The dependent care tax credit, as now designed, is not much help to the people who need help the most.

One method of remedying this topsy-turvy policy is proposed today by the gentlelady from Connecticut. The Child Care Act of 1986 would make families with income over \$50,000 ineligible for the dependent care tax

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

credit and, with the money saved by that change, create a voucher program for low-income families. These vouchers could be used at large day care centers or small family day care programs run by churches. Low-income parents would finally have more of the choices that are now available to middle and upper income parents.

The gentlelady from Connecticut has made very effort to include in this bill those things which are most important to its real purpose and exclude those which are extraneous. I thank her especially for the consideration and accommodation she has made with regard to my own concerns about some provisions.

Federal policy on day care ought to be guided by two principles: First, we should not influence, through financial incentives or any other means, the decision of a family to place a child in day care. This decision is far too personal and has far too many consequences, for the Federal Government to be influencing the choice, and second, we should help those low-income families who must use day care to secure the kind of care which they believe is best suited to them.

Following these principles, I would say that the cap on the dependent care tax credit should probably be lower than the cap proposed by this legislation. I would also say that the voucher might be even better targeted to low-income families by reducing the eligibility level from 200 percent of poverty to a lower level. I would suggest that vouchers are most truly Federal financial assistance to the individual rather than to the day care provider who serves the individual.

In summary, I find the Child Care Act of 1986 an important piece of legislation because it, more than any legislation I have seen to date, serves those two principles which I believe should guide Federal policy in this area. For this reason, I hail its introduction as a major achievement, and I am proud to be one of its original cosponsors.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, many commemorative resolutions come before us for consideration, but few give us as broad an opportunity as we have today to focus on all issues which affect our Nation's elderly. I should like to express my appreciation to my colleagues, Mr. KOLBE and Mr. MCCOLLUM, for sponsoring this special order to celebrate the month of May 1986 as "Older Americans Month."

On Thursday, May 22, in conjunction with Older Americans Month, I, along with the Congressional Arts Caucus, am sponsoring a special presentation of paintings by the late Friedy Becker-Wegeli to the collections of the White House and the National Museum of Women in the Arts. Ms. Helen Hayes will narrate the life of the artist. This event commemorates Older Americans Month and the extraordinary talent of a woman who only began painting at the age of 79 and within a

May 9, 1986

short period developed a style reminiscent of the 17th, 18th century Dutch masters of Floral Still Lifes. The consummate artistry of these two enterprising octogenarians, their courage and dedication, exemplify the contributions older Americans continue to make to the fabric of our society.

Mr. Speaker, our society has been aging while medical technology has been improving rapidly. This means that people now are living longer than ever before. But it also means that we have a larger, older population which poses diverse challenges to public policy makers and private citizens alike.

Just this week, the New York State Office for the Aging released a report on the economic status of the elderly in New York. It states that, in 1983, the per capita income of the elderly in New York State was \$10,130, but half of the elderly had incomes below \$6,929. Add to this bare statistic the cost of living in New York—housing, health care, food, heat, electricity, transportation—and it becomes clear that our senior citizens' golden years are not quite the easy times one might imagine.

Those of us who represent New York City are especially cognizant of the economic difficulties which confront so many of the elderly. Budget cuts necessary to reduce the deficit make the standard solution of throwing money at the problem a thing of the past. This means that we at the Federal level must work closely with State and local officials and the private sector to develop alternatives.

I believe that one of the greatest burdens placed on the elderly today is premature institutionalization. This puts a financial and emotional drain on citizens who could remain in their homes and communities if they only had some basic resources. An integral component of any plan to reach this goal is improving home attendant care, that is, the provision of basic household and personal assistance services. Many of today's seniors could remain independent if they only had some help with routine tasks such as bathing, dressing, shopping, cooking, and cleaning.

While the list of issues affecting senior citizens is long and varied, I believe there is one key thing we must remember as we celebrate Older Americans Month: this group of people is diverse, and has diverse needs. We should keep this in mind during Older Americans Month, and throughout the year.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, a recent op-ed column in the Washington Post credits President Reagan with a successful exercise in mass psychology. The only President to reach his 75th birthday while still in office, Mr. Reagan has made his tenure what David S. Broder calls "the era of the geezer."

How else can one explain the wondrous events of the past few weeks, including Jack Nicklaus' winning his sixth Masters golf

tournament at the age of 46 and jockey Bill Shoemaker riding his fourth Kentucky Derby winner at 54? * * * (and) 81-year-old pianist Vladimir Horowitz playing himself onto the cover of Time magazine with triumphal homecoming concerts in Moscow and Leningrad. * * *

Mr. Broder goes on to cite several other luminaries in sports, politics, and the arts, who achieved distinction and advancing age simultaneously in this decade.

Can it be that Mr. Reagan, who launched a career as a politician when he was well past the retirement age, has sent a hopeful message to all the others facing "the supposed barriers of age"?

The columnist phrases it this way: "Try something impossible, and you may be surprised what happens."

I think that's a wonderful message to contemplate as we again celebrate Older Americans Month.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to join my colleagues in this special order commemorating the month of May as "Older Americans Month," a time set aside each year to express this Nation's gratitude to its senior citizens for their many contributions to our society.

Older Americans Month is also a time to call attention to the special concerns of this growing population and reaffirm the steadfast support of the Congress to the many important programs that have been enacted over the years to protect and enhance the quality of life for Americans in their retirement years.

These vital programs include Social Security, Medicare, and the many services provided through the network of State and local area offices on aging authorized under the landmark Older Americans Act. These programs have helped older Americans to maintain their independence and security in their later years, and it is crucial that our commitment to these programs remains strong.

In the important area of health care, research supported by the National Institutes of Health has helped immeasurably to increase our knowledge and understanding of the special problems which afflict the elderly. A solid framework for continued research into the causes and effective treatments for the tragic victims of Alzheimer's disease has been established through NIH-supported Alzheimer's research centers. It is vital that the momentum that has been established in combating this disease, as well as in fighting such diseases as arthritis and osteoporosis, be continued by providing adequate resources to health research and training efforts nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is still a long way to go in ensuring that all of our Nation's elderly can spend their retirement years securely and in good health. Yet, we have come a great distance toward this goal. As we recognize Older Americans Month, it is appro-

priate to note the great progress that has been made and the urgent need to protect these programs for one of our Nation's most precious resources, our older Americans.

GI BILL IMPORTANT TO STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Congress will reject the administration's proposed plan to terminate the new GI bill. Our committee is hearing from military leaders in almost every State urging that the administration's plan be rejected.

Let me cite you an example of the significant benefits derived from the new GI bill. Recently, I was privileged to hear from the adjutant general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Maj. Gen. Anthony C. Spadorcia. As to the impact of the new GI bill in his State, General Spadorcia says:

... the Massachusetts National Guard's retention rates have increased based on the fact that already 316 individuals on our rolls are actually reaping the benefits of the "bill". You may ask, what does that do for us? Simply put, in addition to the financial benefits gained by our soldiers which are then passed on to our colleagues and universities, it gives us a marvelous recruiting and retention tool and most importantly allows for the upgrading of professional skills of our citizen soldiers, which will in turn help them upgrade and improve their civilian job status; thereby increasing their salaries and improving their job status in the civilian community; creating an overall increase in consumer spending within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Based on this, and the impact of the bill on our strength figures both in the recruiting and retention efforts it is important that everything be done to maintain and promote this bill. By far, it is probably the best program seen in the Reserve Forces and Repeal would be disastrous to our overall efforts to maintain and increase strength.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of the new GI bill on the Reserve and National Guard programs in Massachusetts is fairly typical of the positive effect the new education program is having in every State of our great Nation. If the administration is seriously interested in maintaining a strong national defense, it should immediately proceed to withdraw its plan to repeal the new GI bill—a program that has proven to be effective in getting quality individuals to join all branches of the military.

A TRIBUTE TO 40 YEARS OF CARING

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, the hungry and hopeless of this world have been the recipients of relief and development assistance from the pioneer among private

voluntary organizations, CARE. It is my pleasure today to congratulate this fine humanitarian group, and express my sense of pride that the American generosity of spirit found expression in such an approach to helping those less fortunate than ourselves.

Several years ago, when I became a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I turned to CARE and a few other sources to learn more about how the United States and the world donor community really deliver food aid and technical assistance to needy countries around the globe on a massive enough scale to make a difference. As a Member of Congress from the Nation's breadbasket, I knew that the bounty produced in Nebraska alone could feed the starving in the world, but I did not know about the details on how CARE and the other private voluntary organizations really functioned. While I still do not know how to fully solve the persistent and paradoxical problem of world hunger, I do know more now about the yeoman efforts by CARE to fight against international hunger and poverty.

CARE reaches out to all Americans, inviting them to join in projects that not only help the recipients but leaves those giving assistance feeling positive about themselves and their role in the human community. CARE's ethic generates a sense that binds us all together and helps us understand that fortunes and misfortunes are our common lot, and that those who prosper or suffer today may not prosper or suffer tomorrow.

Again, I congratulate CARE, and my committed friends there. Americans generally, and this Member of Congress, look forward to the next 40 years of CARE's efforts for mankind.

NEW JERSEY PRIDE AWARDS

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey produces many outstanding individuals who have contributed to the reputation of our State in the arts, community projects, economic development, education, the professions, energy, the environment, health care, science, technology, and social services.

An organization of distinguished New Jersey citizens has selected a number of residents for the annual New Jersey Pride Awards. Among them are two outstanding residents of the Seventh Congressional District, Eva Gottscho and Dr. David M. Goldenberg, both of Short Hills.

Founder of the Ruth Gottscho Kidney Foundation, Eva Gottscho has been instrumental in organizing and developing a program that has saved the lives of hundreds of people by providing them with artificial kidney machines for home use. Eva Gottscho has earned the admiration, respect and affection of many families who have benefited from this important health care program.

The other recipient of the New Jersey Pride Award, Dr. Goldenberg, is among the most respected and widely read researchers in the field of cancer detection, control and cure. He was a founder of the Center for Molecular

Medicine and Immunology, which he began in Kentucky and has since moved to the Newark, N.J. campus of the University of Medicine and Dentistry.

The National Cancer Institute recently named Dr. Goldenberg an outstanding investigator and awarded a \$9.7 million research grant for his project. Dr. Goldenberg's studies and writings are contributing significantly to the Nation's commitment to learn more about the causes, prevention, and treatment of cancer.

I commend the selection committee of the New Jersey Pride Awards on their choice of these two outstanding individuals and the other award winners who will be honored at an awards dinner May 11. That will benefit the New Jersey Special Olympics, a sports training and athletic competition program for mentally retarded children and adults.

JAMES URATA RETIRES JUNE 1, 1986

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on the first of June of this year, James H. Urata will retire from his post as director of administrative affairs at California State University, San Bernardino.

One of the original eight administrators charged with building a new State college to serve the San Bernardino and Riverside areas, Jim Urata played a major role in the completion of what we now know as Cal State, San Bernardino. He served as the building program coordinator, guiding the evolution of the master plan for Cal State and overseeing the construction of the first facilities on campus.

Jim's forward thinking and leadership were valuable tools in the completion of the construction and the landscaping of the campus. In 1979, Jim was named supervisor of plant operations. Later, having many times proven his administrative talents, Jim became acting executive dean and headed the Department of Public Safety and Community Relations. One short year later, Jim was named director of administrative affairs.

Jim was born in Los Angeles, and lived with his family in Poston, AZ. He served his Nation as an interpreter with the Military Intelligence Language Service and was an Army volunteer. A graduate of San Diego State University, Jim went on to teach industrial arts to high school students there.

Jim has been an active member of the community for many years. Currently, he is serving on the San Bernardino City Water Commission, the Community Hospital Corporate Board, and as president of the San Bernardino Community Scholarship Association, evidence of Jim's commitment to helping his friends and neighbors.

After more than 20 years of dedicated service to Cal State and his community, Jim Urata's retirement will certainly be felt; he will be sorely missed. We know, however, that Jim's efforts, along with those of his col-

leagues, have only benefited our community and our children.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join with me in wishing Jim Urata a very happy and healthy retirement.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOLSOM DAM

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a May 3, 1986 ceremony sponsored by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Central Valley project's Folsom Dam.

Folsom Dam, Folsom Lake, and the Folsom powerplant, located on the American River in Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado counties, were originally authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 and were later reauthorized on a larger scale by the American River Basin Development Act of 1949 to be constructed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. Upon its completion, the project was to be operated by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Today, under the Bureau's authority, the Folsom project is an integral part of the Central Valley project. It provides water for irrigation, domestic, municipal, industrial and power production and provides flood protection for the Sacramento metropolitan area. The project also helps to maintain navigation along the lower reaches of the Sacramento River while Folsom Lake offers an extensive array of recreational opportunities for the public to enjoy.

Construction of the project began in the fall of 1948 and was completed in 1956. By then, the historic flood of December 1955 had already proven the dam worthy of its task. In 1964, it again held back the flood waters when the Hell Hole Dam upstream on the Rubicon River failed, and once again prevented disaster in 1986. The operation of Folsom Lake to control the overflow is generally credited by engineers and public officials with preventing what would otherwise have been catastrophic flooding in the California State Capital and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta areas.

Mr. Speaker, Sacramento is truly fortunate to receive the outstanding service of the Folsom project along with the protection and opportunities that it provides. On behalf of the citizens of Sacramento, I extend my personal thanks and congratulations on a job well done and I look forward to the Folsom project's continued service and success in the future.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, CARE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago this week, on May 11, 1946, the world's first

CARE packages were received on the docks of Le Havre, France, and distributed to needy survivors of World War II. In the years since then, CARE has become the leading symbol of American generosity to those in need. In congratulating CARE, we also pay tribute to the many individuals who have supported it, and who continue to share generously from their own pockets to provide assistance to individuals wherever it is needed.

Today, CARE packages are a symbol of the past in Europe, where many nations have for several years been organized to donate through CARE, rather than to receive from it. CARE itself is still very much alive and active in 35 countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Originally, CARE stood for Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe. In keeping with its evolving role, the name was changed many years ago to Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere.

CARE still plays an important role in distributing food to needy people, much of it Public Law 480, title II supplies made available from U.S. agricultural surpluses, which CARE combines with donations it raises privately. Its approach has changed over the years as the organization has moved beyond simple distribution of the familiar CARE package. Now, food distribution is the foundation for a wide variety of development activities, from forestry, where CARE is a leader in this vital field in Africa, to health and nutrition, education and small enterprise development.

Any tribute to CARE's 40 years of efforts at improving living conditions for the poor around the world must include a reference to the remarkable individual who has headed the organization throughout its history, Wallace J. Campbell. Wally was honored in 1983 as one of the first recipients of the Presidential End Hunger Award and has been recognized around the world for his efforts. I can think of no other American who has devoted a lifetime to helping others around the world, and who continually remains open to new ideas and approaches as Wally has. He has good reason to be proud of his life's work.

I am honored to join with many others around the world in congratulating CARE—its staff and the individuals who have supported it many varied ways—on its 40 years of achievements.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, May 11, 1986, marks the 40th anniversary of the delivery of the first CARE package in Le Havre, France. Since this date, CARE has delivered over \$4 billion in goods and services around the world. This important occasion affords us an excellent opportunity to reflect upon and honor CARE's long-time commitment to providing people-to-people support for the world's poorest individuals.

When CARE was first founded 40 years ago, its letters stood for Cooperative for

American Remittances to Europe. As the name indicates, CARE's main duty at that time was assisting in the reconstruction of war-torn Europe. However, CARE's great success soon prompted an expansion of its services worldwide and the name was changed to Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, which better described its expanded responsibilities.

Over the years, CARE's operations continued to grow and flourish. A particularly important event was the passage of Public Law 480, the "food-for-peace" law. This measure enabled CARE for the first time to sponsor large-scale food assistance programs in the Third World. Most of CARE's existing programs were made possible by this landmark legislation.

CARE has been involved in nearly every field of development and emergency relief and has been at the forefront of innovative development techniques and strategies. At present, CARE operates the world's largest agroforestry program which is geared toward reviving overworked or denuded land.

Currently, CARE is the largest nonsectarian, nongovernmental, nonprofit development and relief organization in the world. CARE has affiliates in several nations with a staff of 270 in the United States, 250 international staff in overseas missions and approximately 4,000 nationals to oversee various projects throughout the world. With programs in 35 countries on three continents, CARE reached over 23 million people in 1985.

In October 1985, CARE received a Presidential World Hunger Award in recognition of its 40 year commitment to developing long-range solutions to the problems of hunger, poverty and disease throughout the world. While CARE faces many challenges today, their past success in combating these problems is certainly a cause for optimism. On CARE's 40th anniversary, I know that my colleagues will join me in honoring their dedication and commitment to helping individuals the world over.

**CONGRESSMAN FAZIO COM-
MENDED FOR DISASTER AS-
SISTANCE AMENDMENTS**

HON. DOUGLAS H. BOSCO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, last February, California was hit by one of the worst storms in its history. The cost of damages to homes, businesses, schools, public facilities, and roads has far exceeded the amount of funds presently available for Federal disaster assistance.

For this reason, I strongly endorse Congressman FAZIO's disaster assistance amendments to the urgent supplemental appropriations bill. This vital disaster assistance package would provide \$250 million for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA provides disaster assistance to individuals and localities, and will run out of revenues in May without this infusion of money. FEMA field personnel estimate that California

alone will need \$50 million for these additional funds. The Fazio amendment also provides \$20 million for the Department of Education's disaster assistance program. Much of the damage to schools occurred in my district, and this fund is the sole source of Federal relief. The California Department of Education has preliminarily identified \$8.7 million in damages to schools in 21 counties. The need for additional money is obvious.

Mr. FAZIO's package also supplements: The Corps of Engineers (\$25 million); the Soil Conservation Service (\$25 million); and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (\$10 million).

On behalf of the citizens of the First Congressional District, and the residents of northern California, I want to commend Mr. FAZIO for including this urgent Federal assistance package in H.R. 4515, the supplemental appropriations bill.

SALUTE TO ROBERT DEMATTIA

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of this honorable body the work, dedication, and service of a gentleman from my district.

During my years in public service, I have had the opportunity to meet and represent various persons whose love for this Nation and desire to make it great deserve public acknowledgement. Mr. Robert DeMattia is one of those persons.

Besides dutifully serving America as a member of our armed services during the Vietnam conflict, Mr. DeMattia now serves the interests of this Nation in a different way.

A resident of western Wayne County, Mr. DeMattia believes in the American dream, and even symbolizes what it means. His company—the R.A. DeMattia Co.—has become a vital force and catalyst for economic development both in my district and the State of Michigan.

With foresight and diligence, he has taken an area that once lay vacant and unused and built a thriving, growing industrial park which, in my opinion, is the hallmark of development—being built in partnership with the people of the community.

He has successfully weaved together the requirements of business with the needs of residents. His park provides an attractive, practical location for a wide range of firms. But more importantly, it was built to community standards with leaders of the community involved in the planning, selling, and building processes.

The creation of the park and subsequent influx of firms has resulted in more jobs for the community, as well as saving others. It also provides an industrial tax base which will help ease the local tax burden while ensuring quality services and education for years to come.

It deserves noting that Mr. DeMattia also has become an ambassador of good will—helping foreign firms locate in the United

States and become established as American companies. He correctly helps us all realize that such companies aren't "foreign firms," they have invested in America and are as much a part of our Nation as other employers.

The success of his efforts can be measured in one very simple way, he's already started work on a second park in the same area.

And this, Mr. Speaker, this industrial park, is but one of many projects he has undertaken.

Robert DeMattia is a man dedicated to making America a better place to live and work. I salute him for his efforts and ask my colleagues to join with me in thanking him for his contribution to our society.

**THE MAN WHO MADE WAR ON A
WEAPON**

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post contains a lengthy profile of a remarkable man—Col. James Burton. Despite intense pressure from his superiors in the military, and some Members of Congress, Colonel Burton has worked tirelessly to ensure that the M-2 Bradley fighting vehicle is tested under realistic battlefield conditions.

His commitment and dedication to this worthy goal has cost him his career in the military. Rather than recognizing Colonel Burton's efforts, the Pentagon has done everything it can to keep him from testing the Bradley. They have reneged on promises to Congress. They have harassed him. They have even tried to send him to Alaska.

Colonel Burton's treatment is a scandal and a national embarrassment. I urge my colleagues to take the time to read the important Post article about Colonel Burton.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1986]

THE MAN WHO MADE WAR ON A WEAPON

AIR FORCE COL. JAMES BURTON AND HIS COSTLY, CONTROVERSIAL BATTLE OVER THE BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE

(By Myra MacPherson)

The Hollywood version—sexy, but oversimplified—might go like this:

As the credits roll, a bespectacled man walks through the Pentagon maze to a small cubicle in Ring C. He's no one to notice in particular, just one of thousands who work in the bureaucracy of weapons and war. But then this military Clark Kent ducks into an invisible phone booth and comes out fighting.

Zap! A left to the generals. Pow! A right to the defense contractors. Bam! A frontal attack on the Bradley Fighting Vehicle, the controversial armored troop carrier that has gained a reputation in some circles as a dangerous lemon. It's "Whistleblower: The Motion Picture," coming soon to combat theaters near you.

The real story is more complex, but it certainly doesn't lack drama. It is the story of Air Force Col. James Gordon Burton—who was forced into retirement, his supporters say, after relentlessly pushing for realistic tests of the Bradley and incurring the wrath of Defense Department secretaries and un-

dersecretaries, four-star generals and defense contractors alike. It is a tale about charges of suppression and coercion, about leaked documents, about billions in defense funds, about outraged Bradley defenders and about an angry band of influential congressmen on the Hill and a handful of military reformers in the Pentagon who see in Burton's saga the Ultimate Raw Deal.

Burton's supporters view him as a lone voice trying to save the lives of the estimated 50,000 infantrymen who would ride in the vehicles. "The Bradley is a mobile ammunition dump that would blow with catastrophic results," says a tester present at some of the Bradley tests. Burton's opponents call the vehicle "an infantryman's dream"—faster and more powerful than any personnel carriers ever built.

Since the Bradley controversy erupted, the Pentagon has several times attempted to transfer Burton out of arms way; once it tried to send him to Alaska, the U.S. equivalent of Siberia. Last month he was ordered to move to Ohio's Wright-Patterson Air Force Base or retire. He chose retirement. The weapons tester, who turned 49 on May 3, will be out of work on July 1, his retirement date. Until then he'll continue to answer questions from a team of investigators from various Armed Services subcommittees sifting all the charges and countercharges. Last week, Sen. David Pryor (D-Ark.), a leader of the Military Reform Caucus, and Sen. William V. Roth Jr. (R-Del.), chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, requested that the Defense Department inspector general's office investigate the events surrounding Burton's resignation.

The Pentagon vociferously denies that he is being harassed for his views on Bradley testing. "There is a mythology being created about the Bradley and the individual involved," declares U.S. Army public affairs officer Maj. Phillip Soucy, a principal spokesman for the Bradley. "He is saying his sole interest is the safety of the soldiers; it's all cloaked in the purest white, but that doesn't cloud over ignorance."

Except for his congressional testimony, Burton himself is silent. He has adamantly refused to talk to the news media. Friends portray him as a man who tried to work through the system and is particularly sensitive to charges of grandstanding that typically follow those labeled "whistleblowers." Foes accuse him of hiding behind leaked documents.

"There's no question in my mind that Jim is dedicated to doing things right on behalf of the country as he sees them," says one of Burton's former bosses. "On the other hand, there is a shrillness of zeal in Jim's approach . . . The system has difficulty with such zeal; I can see where those in power might feel they have the right to fire him."

The Bradley Fighting Vehicle, built by FMC Corp., is a 25-ton armored personnel carrier with a 25 mm cannon and antitank missiles mounted on top; it looks like a small tank, though its primary purpose is still to carry infantrymen into combat. The Army plans to buy almost 7,000 Bradleys at a total cost of \$10.6 billion. So far 3,000 Bradleys have been purchased at \$1.5 million apiece.

To Soucy, the Bradley "represents the best chance the infantryman has ever had on any battlefield to actually influence the outcome of the battle. It is the best tool we've handed to the infantry since the longbow."

To its critics, the vehicle is a deathtrap—they've nicknamed it "the Ronson"—that could incinerate the men inside if hit by enemy fire.

The Bradley fight features plenty of the usual posturing and positioning, vested interests and verbal jabs. But there is an exceptional, angry rawness to the rhetoric coming out of Congress and the Pentagon in this case.

Burton's supporters on the Hill, citing documents generated by the colonel, talk about rigged tests of "survivability" and a pattern of "stonewalling and deception" by the Army. Says Soucy: "Members of Congress have stood on the floor of the House—a nice convenient place where they can't be held accountable—and said the Army lied, cheated, gilded, misrepresented."

The Army contends that Burton and his supporters misrepresent the facts through half-truths and misinterpretation of data—partly out of ignorance and partly (in the case of the politicians) because Pentagon-bashing plays well to constituents. And in a rare four-star rebuttal to congressional charges of deliberate deception by the military, Gen. John A. Wickham, Jr., the Army chief of staff, protested that "Honor is not an empty word to the soldiers of the United States Army. We stake our lives and the freedom of our country on our sacred honor."

Sen. Pryor has been particularly outspoken. "It is not Colonel Burton we should be getting rid of," Pryor said in one statement. "Instead, it is those who have tried to rig tests, those who have tolerated rigged tests and those who have conspired to unload Colonel Burton that we should be showing the door."

Sandy-haired and slender, quiet and non-flamboyant, Burton seems an unlikely figure to inspire the kind of controversy that surrounds him today. But conversations with friends, colleagues and family members confirm that Burton's unassuming manner belies a stubborn competitiveness that helps keep him fighting against long odds.

Born in Normal, Ill., at the tag end of the Depression, Burton knew success early. He collected straight A's from first grade through high school and was also a star athlete who received offers from professional baseball teams.

"The scouts were after him all the time," recalls his mother, Aileen Fowler. "They said, 'He's awfully thin, put a lot of weight on him.' And I'd say, 'You just stay away from him. I want him to go to college.'"

Though small (he is now only 5 feet 9), Burton also played basketball, and he was honored as the best high school quarterback in the area. He was in the National Honor Society, was president of the student council and of the junior and senior class, and won the American Legion award for outstanding character and dependability.

Because his parents separated when Burton was 4 and his mother had to go to work, his grandmother cared for him much of the time. His grandfather, a railroad engineer who was also a state legislator, was steeped in Abraham Lincoln lore and there was much talk of books and politics at the dinner table.

When he heard the Air Force was starting an academy, Burton applied. Of 6,000 Illinois applicants, he was the first picked.

The first Air Force Academy class, which graduated in 1959, was a little like the first crop of astronauts, a competitive Right Stuff crowd with high visibility and high ex-

pectations. The academy was full of World War II memories, patriotism, and unquestioning loyalty to all things military. "And no one was more straight-arrow than Jimmy," recalls a former roommate, John Howell. "Compromise was not his strong suit."

Burton believed fully in the Air Force honor system and was horrified by the academy's recent cheating scandals. "It's a wonderful thing," he told his home-town newspaper while still a cadet, "to know that the code is so strong. My best buddy served three months confinement to his room because he misread a reg on drinking. He turned himself in."

As the smallest and first class—300 started, 100 didn't make it—the pressure to make good was intense, Howell recalls. "Eisenhower said we were going to build this academy, and the Air Force had a charter to handpick everyone from instructors to students."

Burton's photo album contains a picture of him at the White House with Mamie and Ike, standing ramrod stiff in his dress uniform one of the four outstanding members of the class picked for this occasion.

Burton's wife Nancy was his high school sweetheart, though they broke up while he was at the academy and she was getting her master's in music at the University of Illinois. Burton was engaged to someone else when he heard that Nancy was about to be married; he promptly broke his engagement and put on a full court press to get her back.

The straight-arrow image remains. Burton is an usher at Springfield United Methodist and Nancy is choir director. He was a Methodist Youth Counselor and coached Little League baseball teams when his son—now a 25-year-old architecture student—was small. A 19-year-old daughter is studying biology.

He would probably not be giving the big guns at the Pentagon trouble today except for an illness that changed the course of his career 20 years ago. No one knew what was wrong when Burton, who had become increasingly weak and pale, nearly fainted one day. His blood count was dangerously low, and he was bleeding internally. Because he was born with a malformed stomach, the source was difficult to locate. If he had a bleeding ulcer, for example, it did not show up. Doctors decided to treat him as if he had an ulcer, and eventually the bleeding stopped. But it took a long time, and by then, Burton had been grounded.

"It just really killed him," says one friend. "He loved flying." Friends and relatives say that Burton doesn't talk much about his feelings, but they sense that an "introverted spirituality" pulled him through.

"What a loser!" That was the first impression of two of Burton's colleagues when they met the newcomer to the Development Plans Office in the mid-'70s. They were part of a new wave of military analysts taking a fresh and more independent look at how to decide what to buy. "We had to cut out all the malarkey and get down to what was needed and not needed," says one.

Burton had moved rapidly through the ranks, and at least one coworker, cost analyst Charles Spinney, suspected that a don't-rock-the-boat attitude might have helped him in his ascent. Spinney says he "had this strong impression that [Burton] lived and died by the system; a real defender of the farm. I thought he was hopeless."

The new officer didn't have much impact at first. "We always had to fight for what we wanted," recalls another R&D aide. "I remember after a screaming session with a

two-star general, he finally looked me straight in the eye and said, 'You're right.' But during the argument, I thought Burton was going to die, pulling at my sleeve to back off."

But he changed, "It was like watching a child grow up before your eyes," the aide says. "Burton's turned out to be better than all of us . . . [he] knows when someone's feeding him a line of bull and how to tell them exactly what they're doing and what to do with it."

A moment of truth came when Burton realized that an officer he considered a friend was lying and using him to push ineffective projects. Boyd laid out the case for and against the man and told Burton, "that guy is no friend." It took a few days before Burton agreed.

"There was a fork in the road and he made a decision," says Boyd. "And I might add he's done magnificently."

Decision made, however, Burton found himself facing the classic whistleblower's dilemma. For while Defense officials have for years maintained that waste, fraud and abuse in Pentagon spending is best uncovered by conscientious bureaucrats working within the system, the short list of critics who have actually spoken out have done so at high personal cost in a decidedly hostile atmosphere.

Knowing Burton's reputation for speaking out against current doctrine, a number of generals tried to block his appointment to the Bradley testing job. "There were 14 stars in all trying to keep him from getting that testing and evaluation job," said Boyd. Dr. Alton Keel, an assistant secretary of the Air Force and Burton's boss at the time, refused to bow to the pressure.

Burton "has absolutely the purest motives of any officer in the Pentagon that I know of," says one military critic of the DIVAD—the diversion artillery antiaircraft gun long defended by the Army until Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger decided last year that it didn't work. "[He] could see I was under stress, beating my forehead against my desk," says the critic with a laugh. "He would come by with words of encouragement: 'As long as you're sure you're right then go ahead.'"

But sometimes, the man adds, "[Burton] can make enemies by saying things in exaggerated form." The Army consistently says that its computer models rebut Burton's testing points, for example; his response, according to the DIVAD critic, was to call the computer models so useless that "you might as well cut open a goat and read the entrails."

When Burton read this article he thought, let's test the Bradley to see if these charges are true. It took him nearly three years to force the Army to conduct live-fire tests.

This January, after results of the classified tests were sent to Congress, members of Congress quickly released a report in which Burton charged that the tests had been carefully set up to avoid serious damage.

Shots fired at the vehicle were "not random nor representative of the locations of combat impacts," the report stated. "Each of the 10 live fire shots was aimed so as to avoid intentionally striking the explosive elements of internally stowed ammunition—even though there are likely to be a fair number of direct hits on ammunition in real combat." And according to Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D-Fla.), the Army put water cans inside the Bradley instead of ammunition boxes that might explode during tests.

The Army says that Burton and Bennett misread the test reports. "Both of those statements are made in ignorance," says Army spokesman Soucy. After one test in which ammunition was hit and the Bradley blew up, the Army stated, ammunition was deliberately moved from the "aim point, the center of mass of the vehicle [the point where an attacker would most likely aim]," thus making it less likely that the ammunition would be hit in combat.

Ridiculous, scoffs one congressional aide involved in the Bradley fight. Moving the ammunition "makes a terrific difference in survivability during the test—but all combat data shows actual hits are all over the goddam place," Burton followed up with a dense memo concluding, "Instead of most of the hits falling inside the ellipse, as the Army has claimed, clearly most of the hits fall outside."

"Burton does not accept the fact that there are casualties in war," says Soucy. That argument's a "red herring," counters the aide. "The question is whether the vehicle is so constructed that undue casualties occur."

Among the numerous other conflicts over the Bradley test results, one of the most controversial and least convoluted concerns the watering down of dummies.

Burton revealed that dummies—placed in the Bradley to see if aluminum vapors from the hull could poison soldiers when the vehicle was hit—had been hosed down before the tests. The hosing meant that Army fatigues were less likely to catch fire and, critics charged, produced far more favorable results.

Soucy says that "fumes from burning clothes were stronger than the vaporifics we were trying to test. We wanted to get the vaporifics, not the smell of cotton burning." One tester who was at the site says "that's b.s.," arguing that burning uniforms would not have any effect on the sensing devices.

The Bradley testing has focused, for the most part, on fairly narrow questions. But much of the ferocity of the dispute has to do with what both sides believe are the larger stakes. The Army sees the Bradley as too crucial a weapon to lose, and argues that it is less vulnerable, faster and more maneuverable than the vehicle it replaces (the M-113, which was used in Vietnam).

Retired brigadier general E.M. Lynch, an armored infantry squad leader in World War II and a veteran of Korea and Vietnam, maintains that the Bradley—far from an improvement on past personnel carriers—was ill-conceived from the start. "These Beltway Bandits came up with this dumb concept, 'force multiplier,' it's supposed to be able to do a number of things; including not only carrying troops but fighting too," Lynch says. "So they put the turret and gun on it and all the other things, had to cut down on the size of the squad in order to carry all the ammo . . . Compared to the tank it is so vulnerable but it has to operate in the same environment. So they came up with 'overwatch.' Which means it will sit back [hundreds of yards] and 'overwatch' the squad with the big turret gun. It's the most ludicrous thing in the world . . ."

"Someone asked if I could get a squad into it. I said, 'Maybe the first—but not the second. Their first introduction would be watching a complete squad annihilated.'"

When Burton was given the Ohio-or-else transfer order, influential Hill backers shot off a letter to Weinberger. Colleagues have described the job Burton was to assume at Wright-Patterson—"deputy director of mis-

sion area analysis"—as "being in charge of counting gas masks and parachutes."

Defense officials note that Burton has served far more time in the Washington area (16 years) than the normal tour (three years, sometimes expanded to six)—but that time includes service at Andrews Air Force Base and at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Fort McNair. In any case, members of Congress say they had Weinberger's assurance that Burton would remain through the testing and that this transfer "comes at a crucial time in the Bradley testing," which had come about "entirely due to the effort of Col. Burton."

Burton foes in the Army protest that he is playing the martyr when he really just doesn't want to relocate. "Part of the deal all along," they claim, was that even after his transfer, he would be called back to work on the Bradley tests until their completion. They produce a letter, written by Weinberger to complaining congressmen, stating that Burton was "advised of this possibility on 7 April." Close friends and family members, however, insist that Burton was told about it only after he had turned in his resignation papers.

Both Burton's and the Bradley's futures remain uncertain. Burton has suggested configuration changes that would store fuel and ammunition on the outside of the Bradley, which would add to the cost. Some Bradley critics in the Pentagon and on the Hill believe the congressional investigation will be a whitewash. They note that a principal investigator is on the staff of the Armed Services procurement and military nuclear systems subcommittee, headed by Rep. Sam Stratton (D-NY), who is sympathetic to the Bradley and not to Burton.

"When he leaves there will be a huge void," says Spinney. "Hard-core testing will just go down the tubes. There is just such tremendous institutional pressure, I don't know of another colonel as tough in the building."

Friends say the pressure is getting to Burton, who is looking more and more tired these days. He and his wife have no idea what they will do after July.

"I think he'll come out of this all right," Spinney says. "It is a fundamentally moral question for him; not giving in to inferior equipment that will needlessly kill more people."

Burton loves to sail, unwinding by himself on his boat on the Chesapeake. "If this were a movie," says a friend, "it would end with the Bradley demolished—and Jim sailing off into the sunset."

OCCUPATIONAL HAZARD COMMUNICATION ACT OF 1986

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], has a dual purpose. First, the bill establishes a Federal program requiring employers to notify workers that they are at risk because of a hazardous occupational exposure to toxic materials. Second, the bill establishes protections for workers against discrimination on the basis of notification of occupational health hazards.

We intend to offer this bill as a substitute for H.R. 1309, a bill that is scheduled for joint markup on Wednesday, May 14, 1986, by the Subcommittees on Labor Standards and Health and Safety, of the Education and Labor Committee. An earlier draft of our bill was widely circulated to the business community, organized labor, and Federal regulatory agencies. Every effort has been made to incorporate suggested changes where possible while staying within our goal of safeguarding worker health without creating unnecessary Federal bureaucracy and expense.

The bill we are introducing requires the Secretary of Labor to amend the OSHA hazards communication standard. This approach is far more cost effective than H.R. 1309 and yet will provide workers with the information necessary to take precautions against being exposed to dangerous levels of hazardous substances.

SECTION-BY-SECTION

Section 1. Title. "Occupational Hazard Communication Act of 1986."

Section 2. Findings and Purposes.

Section 3. Research. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) is required to conduct research in improving the means of surveillance of employees exposed to occupational health hazards, and research in improving the means of medical monitoring and treatment of employees exposed to occupational hazards.

Section 4. Hazard Communication Standard. Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment, the Secretary of Labor shall amend the hazard communication standard so that the standard—

(1) Applies to all employers, including manufacturing, mining, construction, and transportation;

(2) Requires that employers provide notice and training to current employees concerning health hazards to which employees are exposed in the employees' work areas;

(3) Requires that employers transmit a notice to former employees whose addresses are known by the employer identifying health hazards that were present in the employees' work areas during their employment and of which they were not previously informed or informing such employees that copies of a list of such hazards are available to the employee upon written request received within one year after the date of such notice; and

(4) Requires that training of employees with respect to hazards emphasizes the chronic and acute health effects associated with such hazards in a manner which promotes early detection and treatment.

Notice to former employees shall not be used as evidence that an employee was exposed to that hazard in any judicial or administrative proceeding.

Section 5. Employee Discrimination. No employer shall discharge or discriminate against any employee on the basis of notification that he or she is at risk of any occupational disease.

Any employee who is determined to have been discriminated against shall be restored to his or her employment and shall be compensated for any lost wages.

Any such discrimination complaint shall be reviewed in the same manner as a complaint filed under section 11(c) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

Section 6. Enforcement Authority. Except as otherwise provided, this standard shall be

administered and enforced under the act in the same manner as a standard prescribed pursuant to section 6 of the act.

Penalties. The failure of a chemical manufacturer or other employer to make a hazard determination, to have a written hazard communication program, to properly label or use other warnings, to record on a material safety data sheet the information required with respect to any chemical, or to establish and conduct an employee training and information program shall be treated as a serious violation under section 17(k) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

Any person who willfully violates such standard shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$25,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both; except that a second conviction shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$50,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

Any person who knowingly makes a false statement in any material safety data sheet required by such standard which could result in serious physical harm or death shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$25,000 or not more than 1 year imprisonment, or both; except that a second conviction shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$50,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

For purposes of any coal or other mine, the hazard communication standard as amended pursuant to this act shall be treated as a mandatory standard pursuant to section 101 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act and shall be administered and enforced in the same manner as a standard prescribed under section 101 of such act.

Notwithstanding section 506 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act, such standard shall preempt any state or local law pertaining to evaluation and communication of health hazards in coal or other mines.

Section 7. Effect on Other Laws. Notification of an employee under the standard shall not commence the tolling of any statute of limitations with respect to any legal claim, except as may be specifically provided by State law.

Section 8. Definitions.

H.R. 4793

A bill to establish a system to provide workers with additional information concerning their exposure to hazards in the workplace, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Occupational Hazard Communication Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) potentially harmful substances and physical agents are in wide industrial and commercial use in the United States;

(2) workers may suffer disability or death or both from occupational diseases caused by hazardous occupational exposures;

(3) protecting occupational safety and health facilitates interstate commerce and promotes the general welfare;

(4) early notification of exposure to harmful substances and physical agents often permits medical intervention in the biological process of disease to either prevent or, by early detection, successfully treat some disease conditions;

(5) workers should be informed of exposure to an occupational hazard and the risks

of contracting an occupational disease from such exposure;

(6) there is a need for increased research to identify the causes of occupational diseases; and

(7) prevention and early detection of occupational disease may reduce the costs of medical treatment and care in the United States.

(b) PURPOSES.—It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to establish a Federal program to require employers to notify workers that they are at risk because of a hazardous occupational exposure; and

(2) to establish a set of worker protections against discrimination on the basis of notification of occupational health hazards.

SEC. 3. RESEARCH.

The Secretary shall, primarily through the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, conduct research into improving the means of surveillance of employees exposed to occupational health hazards, and research into improved means of medical monitoring and treatment of employees exposed to occupational hazards. Such research shall include but not be limited to the following areas—

(1) studying the etiology and development of occupationally related diseases, and the development of disabilities resulting from such diseases;

(2) developing means of medical surveillance of employees exposed to occupational health hazards;

(3) examining the types of medical treatment available to workers exposed to occupational health hazards, and the means of medical intervention to prevent the deterioration of the health and functional capacity of employees disabled by occupational diseases;

(4) studying and developing medical treatment and allied social services to be made available to employees exposed to occupational health hazards; and

(5) developing educational programs designed to advise employers, employees, and employees' families to take measures which ameliorate the effects of those hazards and diseases.

SEC. 4. HAZARD COMMUNICATION STANDARD.

(a) REQUIRED STANDARD.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall amend the hazard communication standard contained in section 1910.1200 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations so that such standard—

(1) applies, notwithstanding section 4(b)(1) of the Act, to all employers, including manufacturing, mining, construction, and transportation;

(2) requires that employers provide notice and training to current employees concerning health hazards to which employees are exposed in the employees' work areas;

(3) requires that employers transmit a notice to former employees whose addresses are known by the employer—

(A) identifying health hazards that were present in the employees' work area during their employment and of which they were not previously informed; or

(B) informing such employees that copies of a list of such hazards are available to the employee upon written request received within one year after the date of such notice; and

(4) requires that training of employees with respect to hazards emphasizes the chronic and acute health effects associated

with such hazards in a manner which promotes early detection and treatment.

(b) **USE OF NOTICE.**—Notice given under subsection (a)(3) of the presence of a health hazard in the workplace shall not be used as evidence that an employee was exposed to that hazard in any judicial or administrative proceeding.

SEC. 5. EMPLOYEE DISCRIMINATION.

(a) **DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.**—No employer shall discharge or in any manner discriminate against any employee on the basis that the employee has been notified that he or she is at risk of any occupational disease.

(b) **REINSTATEMENT.**—Any employee who is determined to have been discriminated against in violation of this section shall be restored to his or her employment and shall be compensated for any lost wages (including fringe benefits and seniority).

(c) **REVIEW OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS.**—Any employee who believes he or she has been discriminated against by any employer in violation of subsection (a) of this section, may, within 30 days after such violation occurs, file a complaint with the Secretary alleging such discrimination. Any such complaint shall be reviewed in the same manner as a complaint filed under section 11(c) of the Act.

SEC. 6. ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), the hazard communication standard amended by the Secretary in accordance with section 4 of this Act shall be treated as a standard prescribed by the Secretary to section 6 of the Act. Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), such standard shall be administered and enforced under the Act in the same manner as a standard prescribed pursuant to section 6 of the Act (but without regard to section 4(b)(1) of the Act).

(b) **PENALTIES.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), a violation of such hazard communication standard shall, for purposes of section 17 of the Act, be treated as a violation of a standard prescribed pursuant to section 6 of such Act, except that—

- (1) the failure of an employer—
 - (A) to make a hazard determination,
 - (B) to have a written hazard communication program,
 - (C) to properly label or use other warnings,
 - (D) to record on a material safety data sheet the information required with respect to any chemical, or
 - (E) to establish and conduct an employee training and information program,

shall be treated as a serious violation under section 17(k) of such Act; and

(2) any person who willfully violates such standard, or who knowingly makes a false statement in any material safety data sheet required by such standard if there is substantial probability that death or serious physical harm could result, shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$25,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, except that if the conviction is for a violation committed after a first conviction under this paragraph, the employer shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) **ENFORCEMENT IN COAL AND OTHER MINES.**—(1) For purposes of any coal or other mine (as such terms are defined in section 3(h) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977), the hazard communication standard as amended by the Secretary in accordance with section 4 of this Act shall be treated as a mandatory standard

prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 101 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977. Except as provided in paragraph (2), such standard shall be administered and enforced under such Act in the same manner as a standard prescribed under section 101 of such Act, subject to such additional regulations as the Secretary may prescribe to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

(2) A violation of such hazard communication standard at such a coal or other mine shall, for purposes of section 110 of such Act, be treated as a violation of a standard prescribed pursuant to section 101 of such Act, except that any person who willfully violates such standard, or who knowingly makes a false statement in any material safety data sheet required by such standard if there is substantial probability that death or serious physical harm could result, shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$25,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, except that if the conviction is for a violation committed after a first conviction under this paragraph, the employer shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$50,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

(3) Notwithstanding section 506 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, such hazard communication standard shall preempt any State or local law pertaining to evaluation and communication of health hazards in coal or other mines.

SEC. 7. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

The notification of an employee under the standard prescribed pursuant to this Act shall not commence the tolling of any statute of limitations with respect to any legal claim, except as may be specifically provided by State law.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the terms "Secretary", "employer", and "employee" have the meaning given by section 3 of the Act; and

(2) the term "the Act" means the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI SAMUEL BERMAN

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to inform this body that an outstanding citizen of my district is being honored for 50 years of dedicated service.

The individual I speak of is my friend, Rabbi Samuel Berman, who will be honored by his congregation, Temple Beth-El of Jersey City, at a weekend-long celebration which will bring the congregation, community, and our State and Nation together.

I am pleased to have been invited to attend this observance, along with Jersey City's Mayor Anthony R. Cucci, U.S. Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, and others.

With the assistance of Milton Gottlieb, a member of Temple Beth-El, and the Jewish Standard, I am providing biographical information of our honoree.

Born and raised in New Haven, CT, his interest in the rabbinate was fostered during his early years by his maternal grandfather, Rabbi

Frommer—who at that time was the chief Orthodox rabbi of New Haven—and by his paternal grandfather, the chief Orthodox rabbi in Baltimore. "I come from a long line," he states. "Even my great-grandfathers were rabbis." He credits this family tradition for his own career choice and that of his later brother, Morton Berman, who also chose the rabbinate.

At the age of 18 he moved to New York, where he attended New York University. After earning his bachelor's degree from NYU, he went on to receive a master's degree from Columbia. Subsequently, he completed his rabbinical training and was ordained by the Jewish Institute of Religion—Hebrew Union College. In 1955, he was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

Though he is presently considered to be the dean of New Jersey's reform rabbis, Rabbi Berman describes his early career as slow to burgeon. He assumed the post of rabbi at Temple Emanuel in Englewood when the Jewish community there was still quite small, and then moved on to his position at Temple Beth-El, Jersey City, where the Jewish community, at the time was large and thriving.

Under Rabbi Berman's leadership the congregation's involvement in community, interfaith, interracial, and Jewish affairs reached its pinnacle.

In 1941, an overflow crowd packed the Jewish Community Center to attend a rally organized by Rabbi Berman to protest the plight of the European Jews under the Nazi regime. Senator Alben W. Barkley, who later became Vice President, was the featured speaker.

Rabbi Berman's outreach efforts, however, have not been limited to the Jewish community. For numerous years he conducted interfaith services honoring the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and this year he invited all community clergy to attend his Temple's Sabbath service honoring Dr. King.

Temple Beth-El was also the first religious institution to establish a special fund for the restoration of the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, as well as a fund-raising campaign for Ethiopian relief.

Further, Rabbi Berman and his congregation recognize the significant role played by women in community life. Another first was achieved in electing Blanche Dohrman president of the temple.

Rabbi Berman has not only served his community from the pulpit, but has been chairman of Jersey City Medical Center Board of Managers for 10 years as well as board member of "Can Do," Jersey City's antipoverty agency. He has also been involved in both the Jewish Family Services Association and the Jewish Hospital and Rehabilitation Center of Jersey City. Although he avoids political involvement, he served as chairman of the mayor's advisory committee but refused the position of chaplain when it was offered to him.

Dedicated service is common in the Berman family. Rabbi Berman's wife of 53 years, Florence, was honored on May 5 by the UJA as Woman of the Year for her active participation in the organization. A former radio actress and commentator, her career began in 1934 when she played dramatic roles with such famous personalities as Sam Levine.

Although he is celebrating a golden anniversary of service, Rabbi Berman sees his work as far from complete. He is currently working on a translation and critical editing of the "Midrash Tanchuma," a collection of legends relating to the Torah. He hopes to complete this project when he retires, though he has no plans to slow down at this time.

I am certain that the people of Jersey City and Hudson County and indeed the entire State are pleased with the report that Rabbi Berman does not plan to slow down. His dedication—his spirit—his strength—which have been displayed time and time again in so many social and community causes over the past 50 years, are needed now more than ever.

His 50th anniversary is of special significance to me during 1986, the 100th anniversary year of our beloved Statue of Liberty. While the entire world joins in the salute to this gracious lady, who is 100 years old, standing tall and proud and noble, we must remember and thank people like Rabbi Berman who indeed have stood tall for America.

Let us echo the words of Bishop Frank J. Rodimer of the Diocese of Paterson who wrote:

Who is America and where? Is she white or black, oriental or native American? Is she Catholic, Protestant or Jew, or some other faith, or even a skeptic? Is she to be found in the city, in the suburbs or in the country; at the shore, in the mountains, on the plains? America, whom we hail today, is not one of these people, is not one of these places, yet she is all of them in all places that form these United States of America. That is why she is so marvelous.

Our country's name is more technical than beautiful, but we treasure it today. It is a miracle that people with such diverse backgrounds could live in any one state and that fifty such states could come together for a national government. Dictators and emperors through the ages have held peoples together with iron fists, but only for a time. Never before, however, has a nation of people, by the people, for the people continued for two centuries to live, thrive and grow. The United States of America, for all her faults, is the best there is. The name sounds great to us, especially today.

America is our country, and we are American. She is not a statue, she is not a document, she is not a goddess either. She is human and fallible, for she is over 217 million people, not only different but bred on the right to individual expression. The concept hasn't worked perfectly, but it has worked, and it will continue to work for as long as Americans believe in freedom and the right of each person to live in freedom.

It is the opinion of all of us who have been fortunate to have been touched in our lives by Rabbi Berman that he is America. He symbolizes what America is all about—working for equal opportunity, the dignity of man, brotherhood, understanding, community service, and most of all for the peace on Earth which is within the reach of all nations.

Despite man's many advances in air, space, and technological fields during Rabbi Berman's 50 years of serving, there are many men and nations which persist with their misconceptions, prejudices and suspicions and narrow self-interest—there are those who are

heavily involved with prejudice, with threats of war, with terrorism, with exploitation.

Rabbi Berman has been one of the great influences on our community, preaching and living the spirit of America, fighting the social wrongs, working for democracy and social justice, knowing that "Liberty is the only thing you cannot have unless you are willing to give it to others."

With Rabbi Berman's community and religious leadership we have been privileged to witness an inner light—an inner air. Perhaps Adlai Stevenson had Rabbi Berman in mind when he wrote:

When an American says that he loves his country, he means not only that he loves the New England hills, the prairies glistening in the sun, the wide and rising plains, the great mountains and the sea. He means that he loves an inner air, an inner light in which freedom lives and in which a man can draw the breath of self-respect.

On every occasion when I visit Temple Beth-El or any of the other great synagogues throughout the world, I am reminded of the important part that the Touro Synagogue played, whereat George Washington made the remarks in 1763 in Newport, RI:

To bigotry, no sanction.

To persecution, no assistance.

In closing, I refer to Rabbi Berman, in his giving, has added to the greatness of America, as echoed in the words of Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver:

God built him a continent of glory, and filled it with treasures untold. He studded it with sweet-flowing fountains, traced it with long-winding streams. He carpeted it with soft-rolling prairies, and columned it with thundering mountains. He graced it with deep-shadowed forests, and filled them with song.

Then He called unto a thousand peoples, and summoned the bravest among them. They came from the ends of the earth, each bearing a gift and a hope. The glow of adventure was in their eyes, and in their hearts the glory of hope.

And out of the bounty of earth, and the labor of men; out of the longing of heart, and the prayer of souls, out of the memory of ages, and the hopes of the world, God fashioned a nation in love, and blessed it with purpose sublime.

And they called it America.

We hope to have Rabbi Berman with us for many years, continuing to light candles of hope for our troubled world.

I am certain that my colleagues here present in the House of Representatives wish to join me in this salute to this great servant of God and man.

THE ANTIKICKBACK ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986: THE TIME IS RIGHT TO STRENGTHEN THE HAND OF OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, there are many examples of waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal procurement system—too many in the

area of defense acquisition to readily list new instances coming to light all too regularly. Many of my colleagues and I have worked long and hard to uncover these abuses for public scrutiny and then to correct the system which permitted the abuses in the first place. None of these abuses is more insidious and intolerable than the discovery of the extent to which kickbacks are paid by subcontractors to middlemen buyers who peddle subcontracts for the prime or major contractor. To date, the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations has uncovered many such abuses in the defense industry, but the presumption is that kickbacks of this sort are pervasive throughout the entire Federal procurement system. This assumption is shared by my colleagues in the Senate, Mr. LEVIN and Mr. COHEN, who have done yeoman's work on this issue and have already introduced legislation in that body to stop this abuse.

In public statements delivered in hearings held in the Senate earlier this year—reinforced by findings soon to be released in hearings before the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations—kickback fraud in Federal contract procurement is beyond belief. Robert Bonner, the U.S. attorney for southern California, has stated that up to 50 percent of frontline procurement personnel are on the take—figures based on his office's investigations. When you consider that the top 10 prime defense contractors alone employ 6,200 such procurement personnel and let over \$47 billion in subcontracts in 1984, it is not hard to appreciate the phenomenal extent of the problem. If each contract subject to a kickback costs the taxpayer the estimated 5 to 10 percent of the contract's dollar amount, Americans are being defrauded of hundreds of millions of dollars every year.

The information provided by Mr. Bonner has already been substantiated by the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, John Votz. In on-going nationwide investigations, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has documented numerous kickback and bid-rigging schemes, which constitute a national scandal. Since the data already made public in the Senate and uncovered by House Energy and Commerce Committee investigators deal almost exclusively with defense industry contracts, the proportions of the problem become astronomical when we add in the potential for abuse throughout the Federal procurement system.

We have heard from officials in the Justice Department and other law enforcement agencies that the current law is inadequate to deal with the problem—the only law on the books which deals specifically with kickbacks is the Anti-Kickback Act of 1945, which has not been amended for 25 years. This act has been described as confusing and restrictive, with weak criminal and civil penalties. Such a state of affairs forces our law enforcement officers to use alternative statutes to prosecute offenders when they are caught.

The legislation I am introducing today will give our law enforcement officers assistance from prime contractors who generally do not know of and do not profit from the fraudulent

activities of their procurement employees. The measure encourages prime contractors to report possible kickback schemes to the Federal Government and makes the contractor liable for civil penalties when they are aware of misconduct which they do not report in a timely fashion to the proper authorities. Major contractors are also required to set up procedures to detect and terminate any such schemes. To reinforce this internal monitoring system, prime contractors are also required to submit annual sworn statements to the Government detailing any gifts and/or gratuities that their employees involved in Federal procurement have received from subcontractors during the previous year.

The Anti-Kickback Act is also strengthened by clarifying the statutory language, excising overly restrictive provisions and increasing both civil and criminal penalties. I have attached a summary of the bill's provisions with this statement.

With only the broadest estimates of the cost to American taxpayers for various kickback schemes used by subcontractors for the Federal Government—or the buyers for the prime contractors with whom they deal—it is evident that we are facing a growing national scandal. The legislation I am introducing will assist us greatly in stemming the flow of tax dollars into criminal's pockets and stop the system of defrauding the Government through various kickback and bid-rigging schemes.

I commend this legislation to my colleagues' attention and actively solicit their support to preserve the integrity of our Federal procurement process.

SUMMARY OF THE ANTI-KICKBACK ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986

The Anti-Kickback Enforcement Act of 1986 amends the existing Anti-Kickback Act by reorganizing its provisions and adding new language. In particular, the bill:

- (1) Adds a definition section to the Act;
- (2) Clarifies language prohibiting the payment of kickbacks, the acceptance of kickbacks, and the inclusion of kickback costs in contract expenses ultimately borne by the United States;
- (3) Makes it clear that the Act applies to kickbacks paid by independent sales representatives and by companies that furnish general supplies to prime contractors;
- (4) Expands the Act to prohibit attempted as well as completed kickbacks;
- (5) Expands the Act to prohibit kickbacks paid in connection with any government contract, removing the Act's present restriction to "negotiated contracts";
- (6) Expands the Act to prohibit kickbacks paid to obtain any type of favorable treatment in connection with a government contract, removing the Act's present restriction to kickbacks paid to induce or acknowledge the award of a subcontract;
- (7) Increases the Act's criminal penalties from a maximum of two years imprisonment and a \$10,000 fine to a maximum of ten years imprisonment and a \$250,000 fine for individuals and a \$1 million fine for corporations;
- (8) Expands the Act's civil remedies, now limited to the recovery of kickbacks charged to the United States, to permit the United States to recover twice the amount of such kickbacks plus a \$10,000 civil fine for each occurrence of prohibited conduct;
- (9) Expands the Act's civil remedies to make prime contractors liable for their em-

ployees' misconduct unless, prior to any criminal prosecution or other civil suit on the matter, the prime contractor promptly provides the United States with any information it obtains on the case, cooperates with any government investigation, and, at the time the misconduct occurred, had implemented and was following reasonable procedures to prevent and detect such misconduct;

(10) Clarifies the statute of limitations for filing civil actions, stating that it shall be a period of 6 years;

(11) Codifies existing case law from the Supreme Court, *United States v. Acme Process Equipment Co.*, 385 U.S. 138 (1966), enabling the United States to terminate prime contracts tainted by subcontractor kickbacks;

(12) Clarifies language allowing the United States to use administrative offsets to recover the cost of kickbacks charged to the government;

(13) Adds language requiring prime contractors to report possible violations of the Act to the government;

(14) Adds language requiring employees of prime contractors to file annual, sworn declarations with the United States listing any fees, gifts or other compensation received from subcontractors during the previous year; and

(15) Maintains a provision authorizing the General Accounting Office to conduct audits to investigate violations of the Act and extends the same authorization to other federal agencies.

SOLIDARITY SUNDAY FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our Nation unites Sunday to commemorate Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry. There is a time for the American people to join together and express our support for the thousands of Soviet Jews who are being denied permission to emigrate by the Soviet Government.

Solidarity Sunday is a moving reminder of the continuing denial of the God-given human rights of these refuseniks—Soviet Jews who have been refused permission to emigrate. Soviet leaders and their powerful propaganda and disinformation campaigns would have the world believe that the Soviets have a newfound commitment to promote human rights within their country. Soviet emigration figures, however, tell the true story.

The Soviets, despite their rhetoric, show no interest in improving their human rights record, especially with regard to Soviet Jews. Soviet authorities deny thousands of emigration requests by Soviet Jews each year. Only 1,100 Soviet Jews were permitted to emigrate last year and just 900 were granted permission in 1984.

Symbolic of the Soviet Jews' continuing struggle for religious freedom is the plight of Nadezhda Fradkova, a 38-year-old Soviet woman who repeatedly has been denied permission to emigrate since 1979. Throughout the years, I have followed with sorrow Na-

dezhda's personal difficult battle to keep alive her dream of one day being allowed to worship freely in the country of her choice.

Upon applying to Soviet authorities for permission to emigrate, Nadezhda was fired from her job as a computer analyst. After waiting 4 years with no response from Soviet authorities to her request, she began a hunger strike in March 1983 to protest Soviet inaction. Her hunger strike lasted 6 weeks, during which time Soviet Jews inside the Soviet Union and abroad became aware of her situation and petitioned the Soviet Government to grant Nadezhda's request to emigrate. The Soviets responded on April 13, 1983, by breaking into Nadezhda's apartment and taking her to a hospital where she was drugged and force fed intravenously.

Following her release from the hospital, Nadezhda renewed her request to Soviet authorities to grant her permission to emigrate. Her appeal met with inaction and on December 24, 1983, she began her second hunger strike. Ten days later, the Soviets responded by again breaking into her apartment and forcibly removing her. She was taken to the Leningrad Psychiatric Hospital No. 9 where she was drugged and force fed.

Eventually she was released and returned home. Despite her strong mathematical background and years of study in Soviet schools and universities, she was unable to find work. Soviet authorities, as so often is the case, issued orders not to hire Nadezhda, so she was able to find only scattered work babysitting or cleaning homes.

On August 25, 1984, Nadezhda was arrested by Soviet police in Leningrad and charged with parasitism, a Soviet criminal offense for those people without jobs who are deemed to be living off the state. She was tried on these charges, found guilty, and sentenced on December 18, 1984, to 2 years in prison.

She began serving her sentence in a Leningrad prison, but last May was transferred to a facility in the far north of the Soviet Union near the Arctic Circle. From time to time, we know that she was placed in solitary confinement, and protested each time by going on a hunger strike. According to our latest information, she continues to serve out her sentence in the outer reaches of the Soviet Union.

Many of my colleagues and I wrote the Soviet Ambassador in Washington last month to renew our request that Nadezhda be allowed to emigrate and to ask for an update on her status and condition. To date, we have received no response.

Nadezhda, to our knowledge, is the only woman in the Soviet Union who is incarcerated as a Jewish prisoner of conscience. She has no close family and no job in the Soviet Union, and her emigration to another country would pose no security risk to the Soviet Union. Yet Nadezhda, like thousands of other Soviet Jews, is being denied permission to emigrate.

Mr. Speaker, the courageous ongoing efforts of these Soviet Jews must never be forgotten. Their continuing struggle to achieve religious freedom is an inspiration to us all. It is through our prayers, vigils, letters, and solidarity gatherings like the one planned Sunday that we can provide moral support to Soviet

Jews, like Nadezhda Fradkova, who are determined to one day realize their lifelong dreams to emigrate to a nation like the United States or Israel, where the freedom to worship freely is a sacred God-given liberty.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARE

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 40th anniversary of the founding of CARE, a private voluntary organization that has aided millions of needy people throughout the world. I want to commend the thousands of people who have worked for and with CARE in its first 40 years, congratulate them on their many achievements, and wish them success in the years ahead.

CARE is the largest nonsectarian, nongovernmental relief organization in the world. It sponsors programs in 35 countries that emphasize a wide range of developing country needs including nutrition, health, education, small enterprise development, and agroforestry.

In 1985, CARE food programs reached 23,875,000 people in 19 countries. CARE delivered and monitored over 600,000 tons of food through supplementary and emergency food distribution and food-for-work programs. This effort included 17 countries in Africa, many of which faced a particularly critical food situation in the past year. Inadequate and inefficient transportation systems often slowed the delivery of food aid to famine victims in many regions of Africa. CARE responded by developing major transportation networks in Mauritania, Mali, Chad, Sudan, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Somalia, and Kenya to aid in the timely delivery of food to drought-affected areas.

An entire generation of Americans has grown to appreciate the goodies contained in a "care package" sent from home; whether they be children in summer camp or students away at college. But few in this generation realize how the term "care package" came into use. On May 11, 1946, the first packages labeled CARE were delivered at LeHavre, France, from North America to aid the survivors of World War II. These CARE packages contained sugar, flour, coffee, and essential canned goods that helped meet the needs of grateful Europeans. This month marks the 40th anniversary of that first shipment, and the start of an endeavor that continues to seek long-range solutions to the problems of hunger, poverty, and disease throughout the world.

Today we all know what joy a "care package" from our loved ones can bring. Think how much these CARE packages must have meant to victims of strife, war, and oppression. It is that same spirit of giving and concern that guides the work of CARE today in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Two million people worldwide have entrusted CARE with their private contributions, because they are confident the money will be used in effective, fully integrated development programs.

The cornerstones of CARE's development strategy are community participation and self-help. The implementation of such ideas is essential, or developing countries, especially in Africa, will become increasingly dependent on large donations of western food aid. Such dependency can serve only to slow the economic development of these nations. CARE has been an innovator in using the Food-for-Work Program to foster self-sufficiency in food production by African communities. In both Niger and Chad this program helped farmers in arid regions remain productive.

It was not without reason that CARE received the 1985 Presidential World Without Hunger Award as an outstanding private organization. Last year an estimated 6 million Africans benefited from assistance provided by CARE. The value of resources delivered by CARE to Africa's starving people exceeded \$150 million. In over 40 years of operation, CARE has provided more than 4 billion dollars' worth of goods and services to 86 nations and territories on four continents. Once again I want to acknowledge all those who made CARE's achievements of the past 40 years possible and commend them for their diligence and success. Through continued programs such as CARE's, we can make a difference for the better in the lives of the world's poorest and neediest citizens.

A TRIBUTE TO EPHRAIM TOMLINSON II

HON. H. JAMES SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Ephraim Tomlinson II, who recently received the Humanitarian Award from the Burlington County, NJ, chapter of the Knights of Columbus.

Known better to his friends, colleagues, and neighbors as "Eph" or "The Mayor," this dedicated citizen of the proud township of Medford, NJ, is being appropriately recognized and honored for his long and distinguished career of public service and civic involvement.

His public service to the community of Medford actually spans a period of 40 years, beginning in 1940 when he first served as solicitor. He was subsequently elected to township committee and, before retiring from the local governing body in 1980, put in 16 years as mayor.

Eph has also given generously of his time to an extensive list of social and civic organizations, including the Rotary, Masonic orders, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, the YMCA, several local organizations, and the Burlington County, NJ, and American Bar Associations.

Eph's personal background is interesting in itself. Born in southern New Jersey on January 25, 1914, he was only 8 years old when he slipped under a moving train while boarding. He was rushed to a hospital and his life and badly damaged leg were saved. Twenty-six years later, the leg had deteriorated badly and had to be amputated. Eph rose above this setback.

Fitted with an artificial leg, Eph's level of activity only increased. He would become a

"hands-on" type of public servant, thinking nothing of hooking up a plow to his own vehicle to clear Medford's snow-covered streets and roads, or donating his own labor and equipment to youth camps.

Eph practiced law from his home on one of Medford's shady streets, and his wife, Alice, taught school in the local elementary system. They had four children, including Mary, Ephraim III, Richard, and Joseph, who died at a very early age.

Already a recipient of such awards as Rotary Man of the Year and the Boy Scout's Silver Beaver, Eph easily qualified for the recent Humanitarian Award, and I commend and thank the Knights of Columbus for paying him this honor.

But, Mr. Speaker, I should add that further recognition of "The Mayor" is yet in store. In 6 weeks, the scene will shift to the park off Main Street in Medford. Medford's park system is but another example of Eph Tomlinson's work.

It all began when he donated to the township that land which included Medford's "old swimming hole." Then, with his own labor and that of hundreds of other Medford citizens, Eph worked to develop Medford Park into a beautiful recreation area in the center of town.

On this very site, on June 22, 1986, a gathering of friends and neighbors will witness the unveiling of a sign identifying "Tomlinson Park." A plaque with a likeness of Eph Tomlinson will also mark the site, and there will be an appropriate inscription to remind all Medford residents—present and future—of the generous contributions of this good citizen and gentleman.

KHOMEINI REGIME WAGING WAR AGAINST HUMANKIND

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the Khomeini regime recently launched a huge offensive onto Iraqi territory which cost 50,000 human lives, a high percentage of whom were schoolchildren. The Khomeini government's domestic and foreign policies are characterized by terrorism and grand scale human rights violations. Officials of the regime have admitted to involvement in international terrorist operations and they pose a constant threat to the peace and stability of the Middle East region.

The recent increase in compulsory conscription to Khomeini's death fronts has escalated the military action. Officials of the Khomeini regime are no longer limiting their verbal onslaughts to the takeover of Iraq and the toppling of the Iraqi Government, but have extended their threats to include the gulf countries, especially Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, and have publicly admitted to the possibility of resorting to terrorist activities in those nations.

Today, it is clear that a just peace between Iran and Iraq is within reach. But this hope is dashed by Khomeini's persistence in creating an ongoing state of crisis. There is every reason to think that Khomeini's belligerent ef-

forts to prolong this war stem from his need to overshadow the civil unrest and vicious human rights violations occurring within his own nation.

The people of Iran, the countries of the Persian Gulf region and the international community have persistently and actively condemned Khomeini. The victims of this regime, domestically, regionally and internationally have demanded that appropriate measures be taken.

Recently, more than 5,000 political dignitaries from 57 countries of the world signed a statement declaring that a just peace is achievable and condemning Khomeini's belligerence. The U.N. Security Council and the International Conference for Peace held in Amman, Jordan, have also condemned the Khomeini regime's bellicosity. The growing resistance of the Iranian people against Khomeini best attest to their condemnation of his policies. The growing resistance is an active response to 5 years of brutal repression as Khomeini has tried, in vain, to annihilate the democratic movement that threatens his existence.

Over the past 5 years, the Khomeini regime has executed 50,000 people. Today, 150,000 political prisoners are being subject to medieval tortures. The statistics and reports on these crimes are horrifying. In December 1985, the U.N. General Assembly condemned the Khomeini regime's human rights violations after examining voluminous evidence of abuses and considering the firsthand testimony of three torture victims who escaped from Iranian jails.

One of these victims, Mr. Dadkhah was tortured and his wife executed. He continues to suffer from the effects of torture. Ironically, Mr. Dadkhah was tortured in the same notorious Evin prison where he had also been tortured under the Shah. His case exemplifies the many cases which show a continuation of the Shah's policies by the Khomeini regime.

According to a November 18, 1985, report by Amnesty International:

Torture often begins immediately after arrest, usually in buildings operated by local Komitehs or Pasdaran (Revolutionary Guards). Many such buildings were previously used by SAVAK, the National Intelligence and Security Organization operating during the time of the Shah.

The Khomeini regime is waging war against humankind on three fronts—domestic repression, regional war-mongering, and terrorism abroad.

As Members of the U.S. Congress, we should, and I hope will take a firm stand and condemn these atrocities and work toward ending the vicious violation of human rights which has become a way of life for the people of Iran.

ETHNIC AMERICANS DESERVE RECOGNITION

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues today so that I may call to their attention what I and many other Americans feel

to be a gross oversight on the part of the Statue of Liberty Commission. This July 4, the commission will honor 12 foreign-born Americans at the Statue of Liberty Centennial Celebration. While we applaud the honorees for the awards they will receive, we feel that a great number of American ethnic groups are being excluded from this important celebration.

Recently, the commission announced the 12 award recipients and the ethnic groups they will represent. It was found that these 12 represent only about 20 percent of all American ethnic groups. Particularly noteworthy in their absence of representation were Americans of Irish, Italian, Polish, and Greek descent among others. Over 60 million Americans claim ancestry from one of these four major ethnic groups. In spite of this astounding figure, the commission risks alienating about 40 percent of the American population by not including these ethnic groups in the awards presentation.

The crucial role that the Irish, Italian, Polish, and other ethnic groups played in the building of our country is a well known story in our history. These groups quite literally built the foundations upon which our Nation grew from when one considers their efforts in the building of the roads, rails, and canals which connected the major markets from coast to coast. For this and many other reasons these major American ethnic groups are vitally important to our country. In addition, the Statue of Liberty itself serves as a revered symbol to these peoples as a reminder of the freedom and opportunity that brought them to America in the first place.

It seems clear to me that an event filled with so much patriotism, as our Statue of Liberty Centennial Celebration will certainly be, should make an appeal to as broad a base of Americans as possible. Presently, the commission is ignoring a large and important segment of the American population. If we are going to honor some foreign-born Americans at the centennial celebration, we should be sure to honor all Ethnic-Americans as well. I hope my fellow Members of Congress agree that this is a matter of concern for all of us as Americans.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT REIMBURSEMENT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to express the sense of Congress that Federal employees hired on or after January 1, 1984, should be reimbursed for amounts paid to the Civil Service Retirement System during the period when neither a permanent nor authorized temporary supplemental retirement system is in place.

As my colleagues know, legislation enacted in 1983 to amend the Social Security Act mandated that a new retirement system for civil servants hired on or after January 1, 1984, must be developed. We adopted an interim plan in 1984 which was extended to

April 30, 1986. That interim solution expired last week, without a permanent plan in place. Congressional negotiators are working around the clock with administration officials to develop such a supplemental retirement system.

Without a new system or an agreement on a new system, however, the employees affected must contribute not only to Social Security and Medicare, but also to the Civil Service Retirement System. For many Federal workers, this translates into an additional 6 percent of salary being removed from disposable income. Although I am confident that a compromise will be reached and an extension of the previous temporary system will be authorized, I want to make clear through this resolution that the employees hit unexpectedly by this lapse in the interim retirement program will be reimbursed for any additional amounts they pay while Congress and the administration work out the new system.

I say unexpectedly because most Federal workers hired after 1983, some 300,000 plus, were not advised that their retirement system would be altered within 2 years. Many of the employees are young people, just out of college, who are settling into the concept of supporting themselves. A sudden 6 percent cut from disposable income will be devastating to many of these employees because they have had no time to plan financially for such a jolt to their budgets.

This resolution expresses congressional intent that when an agreement is reached and a new supplemental retirement system is enacted, that any sums lost during the period when no system was in place will be reimbursed.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this action to ease the anxiety of new employees hit by this sudden pay cut.

H. Res. 453

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should refund that part of the contributions which are required to be made by certain officers and employees of the Federal Government to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (and certain other retirement funds), but which would not be so required if the Federal Employees Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 had been extended

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that, upon the enactment of a law establishing a new retirement system for officers and employees of the Federal Government who would be subject to the Federal Employees' Retirement Contribution Temporary Adjustment Act of 1983 if such Act had been extended with respect to Government service performed during the period beginning May 1, 1986, and ending on the effective date of such law, the Government should refund to each such officer or employee an amount equal to the excess of—

(1) the amount deducted and withheld from the pay of such officer or employee under section 8334(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law referred to in the first sentence of section 204(a) of such Act, for such service, over

(2) the amount that would have been deducted and withheld from the pay of such officer or employee for credit to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (or

another covered retirement system, as defined by section 203(a)(2) of such Act) during such period if such Act had been extended with respect to such service.

SALUTE TO HAL ENGLISH

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor a very good friend of mine—Hal English.

This past year, Mr. Speaker, Hal served as a Delaware Valley United Way fundraising co-chairman. As a member of United Auto Workers Local 731, in Ewing, NJ, it was Hal's responsibility to see to it that the local's contribution reached its goal of \$250,000. I am proud to say that with the help of other union officials and with the help of the majority of workers at the Fisher Auto Body Plant in Ewing, Hal and local 731 not only reached the \$250,000 goal, but exceeded it and brought in a total of \$332,261. This, Mr. Speaker, is not only a record high for the Fisher Auto Body Plant and local 731, but it was also the highest amount contributed by any single organization within the Delaware Valley division this year.

Mr. Speaker, the United Way's history traces back to the late 19th century when 2 ministers, a priest and a rabbi, developed the first local community wide organization to coordinate social services and to combine fund raising efforts to help the disadvantaged. Through the 20th century the United Ways, as we know them today, continued to evolve and sought the advice and help of the American business community. Corporate and labor leaders joined together and now continue to work together to conduct a single, efficient, work place fundraising drive, so that the number of charitable appeals is reduced while the number of those served and benefited continues to grow.

Mr. Speaker, today contributions to the United Ways result in financial support for some 37,000 human care service-providing groups. Tens of millions of people are helped each year by United Way services and communities across America are all better off because of the leadership and financial support provided by United Ways.

Mr. Speaker, next to the U.S. Government, United Ways support the greatest variety of human services in our country. Vital, vital programs such as adoption promotion, adult education, suicide prevention, rape crisis relief, mental health education, job training, domestic violence counseling, food banks, drug abuse services, day care, crime prevention, alcoholism services—just to name a few, are all supported and made possible through the United Way's funding pattern. I know in my own district that 35 prime agencies, and many more emergency programs benefit from the support of the Delaware Valley United Way.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1985, alone, the United Way provided \$1,829,469 just in Trenton, the largest city in my district, for programs which truly help people in my district. These

programs include, Red Cross, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, the Jewish Community Center, Homes for Unwed Mothers, elderly services, nursing homes, day care centers, the Urban League, Salvation Army, Mercer Street Friends and others. Each of them, Mr. Speaker, provides great social services for Trenton, and each of these programs is better able to meet the needs of the area because of the assistance they get from the United Ways.

Mr. Speaker, many people believe that one person cannot make a difference. This theory is wrong and can be proven so when we follow the impact that a fundraising drive can have on a community. Each member of the fundraising drive at local 731, including the chairman, Hal English, should be commended and certainly can take pride in knowing, that the work they've done in 1986 has fostered a service that will either help a child find a home; an alcoholic resist a drink; a senior citizen find a friend care, or a hungry neighbor enjoy a meal.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Hal and local 731 for their work and I thank them for making our community a better place to live.

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate again this year in the Congressional Call to Conscience.

In recent years, more and more well-publicized refuseniks have been released in an attempt to lure us into satisfaction. However, over the last 7 years, there has been a dramatic decrease in the number of Jews allowed to emigrate, from 51,000 in 1979 to 894 in 1984. In 1985 there was a small increase to 1,100. The Soviets are hoping that Congress will be lulled into complacency because a few prominent refuseniks were allowed to emigrate. They are wrong. Instead, we must all make refuseniks an issue of prominence. Through efforts like the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil and Solidarity Sunday, we can reaffirm to the Soviets that Congress will not forget about the thousands of Jews enduring persecution.

One of those thousands is a man named Alexander Maryasin. Since 1974, he has applied 20 times for an exit visa to Israel—each time a rejection notice has been returned. The Russian authorities have promised three times to release Alexander and his family. Three times they reneged. His wife Leah has recently been diagnosed as having a brain tumor. Now more than ever they need to emigrate so as to receive advanced medical treatment.

This issue holds a special significance to me as I have seen first hand, the plight of Soviet Jews. During a trip to the U.S.S.R. in 1983, I saw the faces of persecuted Jews; the harsh lines of suffering, the bold looks of defiance. They told me of unwarranted searches, job harassment, and false arrests. I am still

amazed by the seemingly unconquerable strength and conviction these refuseniks hold.

It is for these people and others like them I speak today. We must always keep the human rights issue on top of any agenda between the United States and Russia.

Special orders of this sort are essential to the future of mistreated Soviet Jews. If we continue to emphasize this issue, progress can be made and I sincerely believe, progress will be made.

HAPPY 25TH ANNIVERSARY, FATHER MICHAEL WRENN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have had many occasions to rise before you and share with you the accomplishments of my constituents from the 19th Congressional District of New York. Today, it is my pleasure to share with you the special achievements of a very special man, Father Michael J. Wrenn.

Father Wrenn will celebrate the 25th anniversary of his ordination into the priesthood on May 25, 1961, at the Church of St. Philip Neri in the Bronx, which is the church that I, my wife, and my family have attended for over 30 years.

Father Wrenn has more than one reason, however, to be proud as he is surrounded by friends, family, and congregation on that date. He was recently designated by Pope John Paul II as a Chaplain to His Holiness, an honor that many clergymen work toward, dream of, but never experience. I know that Father Wrenn's outstanding background and his service to his community are only a few of the reasons that he is held in such high regard.

For over a quarter of a century, Father Wrenn has served God and God's people as a parish priest, and then a high school administrator of the Monsignor Scanlan High School, where he founded and directed in 1972 a drug prevention education program which became the prototype for the Archdiocesan Drug Education Prevention Office. In addition, he is a permanent representative of the International Catholic Education Office at the United Nations, director of religious education for the Archdiocese of New York and founder of the Graduate School of Religious Studies at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie in Yonkers, NY.

But Father Wrenn's special talents and accomplishments do not end there. He has mastered the French language and in doing so, has served as a translator of a significant number of articles and books dealing with religious themes, the most recent of which is *The Way of My Cross*, the homilies of the valiant Polish priest and patriot, Jerzy Popieluszko, who was brutally murdered in Poland on October 19, 1984. In addition, he has coauthored and edited many works that themselves have been translated into the French language.

In a year that we observe the centennial celebration of the most famous French heroine, the Statue of Liberty, we are grateful to

Father Wrenn for his contribution to the ongoing cultural exchange between our great Nation and the Republic of France.

It is my pleasure to extend hearty congratulations to Father Wrenn as he is honored on May 25. He is a distinctive man, a man who is looked up to by adults and children alike; he has served as an inspiration for daily living and for life's design. I wish him much continued success and happiness, and many more such happy occasions.

FORTY YEARS OF CARE-ING

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of its 40th anniversary, I today salute CARE for its unflagging and unequalled leadership in the twin causes of relief and development around the world.

CARE's record embodies the very best of the human spirit and the heart of American idealism. Created 40 years ago as the Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, it has become just that. In its first year alone, CARE fed some 3.4 million hungry survivors of war-torn Europe. Since the first CARE package reached France, it has delivered some \$4 billion in goods and services around the world.

CARE has made the life-or-death difference in such disasters as the Biafra food emergency in 1969, the Guatemalan earthquake of 1976, and the recent African famine. Its timely hand of help has served as the lifeline for millions of desperate people around the globe.

Today, CARE reaches out to 40 million people in 35 countries with benefits as diverse as emergency food aid, refugee relief, famine recovery, agroforestry, and family nutrition. Its long-term goal has always been to help low-income and devastated populations to get back on their own feet. But it has never forgotten that "people don't eat in the future, they eat every day."

FOOD FOR PEACE MAKES A DIFFERENCE

Since Congress passed the Public Law 480 "Food for Peace" law in 1954, CARE has creatively used American farm surpluses to feed the hungry throughout the developing world. This has helped family farmers while it relieved human misery in poor nations. This has involved careful planning.

As a member of the House Select Committee on Hunger, I have worked closely with CARE in crafting the right kind of foreign aid. We have struggled together not only to provide adequate food aid for famine emergencies, but also to ensure that food aid contributes to long-term development.

For example, I have strongly supported CARE's innovative approach to food aid as a dietary supplement to improve the nutrition of mothers and children. Improving diets in poor nations offers the surest means of improving health. And healthy people make more productive workers and more attentive students.

Similarly, CARE has pioneered the Food for Work Program by which food aid advances specific, well-planned development projects. Such an incentive for participation in develop-

ment not only extends our aid dollars, but also contributes to local pride in the accomplishment of self-benefiting projects.

Nor has CARE overlooked the mutual interaction of sound diets and quality medical care. For 25 years, its MEDICO affiliates have provided medical training and treatment to help fight the interlocking problems of hunger, poverty, and disease.

A WORLD WITHOUT HUNGER

In a word, CARE has created a shining example of the right kind of foreign aid. It's the kind of aid that builds bridges with hungry nations, without leaving them dependent on external aid. It's the kind of aid which addresses total human needs, not only the emergency response to hunger. It's the kind of aid which meets the kaleidoscope of human needs without losing a singleness of vision.

It's the kind of aid which has drawn other countries—Canada, Norway, and Germany, among others—to begin their own CARE programs. These CARE international affiliates alone provided \$18 million to feed and aid starving Africans during the continental famine.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend CARE President Wallace J. Campbell, the CARE staff, and its entire international organization for making this world a better one.

CARE is people helping people at its very best. For its noble work CARE won the Presidential Award for a World Without Hunger in 1985. But this is work CARE has done every year for 40 years and which I am sure that it will do for 40 more.

WETLANDS IN DANGER

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, the future of our Nation's Wetlands Protection Program is in jeopardy. Nearly 100 million acres of wetlands in this country stabilize groundwater discharge, protect against floods, improve water quality, and provide the home and spawning ground for thousands of plant and animal species. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act was created to protect the wetlands from development which could otherwise be carried out on "upland" sites. For some time now, the Army Corps of Engineers administration of 404 has served only to challenge the law's fortitude. Now, the Army Corps has struck a blow which could likely put 404 in its grave forever. Today, I look to the EPA to stand up for wetlands protection as Congress has directed it to.

Before EPA Administrator now is a 404 "dredge and fill" permit application from a developer to fill a wetland in Massachusetts. Contrary to the recommendations of the New England Army Corps of Engineers, the Army Corps' Washington Headquarters issued the original permit; accepting a new interpretation of the 404 administrative guidelines put forth by the developer. As a result of the Region I EPA Administrator initiated the established review and veto process and recommended the permit be vetoed. The final decision now

rests on the desk of EPA Administrator Lee Thomas.

The demise of 404's ability to protect wetlands will come about in two ways. First, it is highly inappropriate to permit the developer and the Army Corps to reinterpret the guidelines they clearly are not charged with promulgating. Second, if Mr. Thomas acquiesces to the Army Corps' wishes in this case he will turn over responsibility for 404 to an authority that has come under fire for its lack of enthusiasm for 404's stated goals.

While the Army Corps is charged with the responsibility of issuing permits to fill wetland sites, the EPA was directed by section 404 to include a "water dependency tests" which assumes that "practicable alternatives" exists if the project is clearly not water dependent. In the case of the shopping mall, the project is clearly not water dependent. As discussed in the guidelines, practicable alternatives are those that serve the general purposes of the project. The developer in this case has claimed that the alternatives sites originally shown to exist do not meet his specific needs.

Additionally, the developer has offered to mitigate damages to the wetland by creating a new wetland site several miles away. Without even beginning to address the unlikelyhood of success or the fact that there are no standards set by which to shape or judge such an undertaking: the guidelines do not offer mitigation as an alternative to avoiding destruction of an already existing wetland. Common sense dictates that it makes more sense to move a project that is still in its blueprint stage, than to try and move a 35-acre swamp.

The EPA must make their final decision based on the clearly stated intentions of the developer and the guidelines created by their own staff. If the Army Corps' permit is allowed to go through, in clear violation of the guidelines, the message will also be clear * * * the Army Corps will take control of a program which it does not have the expertise to handle.

I urge the EPA to uphold its own guidelines and the proper interpretation of congressional intent for the 404 program.

OCCUPATIONAL HAZARD COMMUNICATION ACT OF 1986

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, millions of workers handle hazardous substances in their daily working routines. In order to prevent workers from becoming ill as a result of their working with these substances, they must know what these substances are, what the chronic and acute health effects are, and how to handle these substances properly.

Today I am joining the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. PETRI, in introducing the "Occupational Hazard Communication Act of 1986."

It is our intent to offer this bill as a substitute for H.R. 1309, the "High Risk Occupational Disease Notification and Prevention Act of 1986," which was introduced by our colleague Mr. GAYDOS and which is scheduled

for subcommittee markup on May 14, 1986. I think many of the goals of this bill and Mr. GAYDOS' are the same, however, we differ on how to approach the issue and what would constitute a workable system.

Our bill requires that employers, through a hazard communication standard, notify current and former workers of the potential hazards and the safest way to handle potentially hazardous materials. It seems to me that this is the logical way to prevent workers from being exposed to hazardous substances.

By contrast, H.R. 1309 does not do enough for current employees. To be fair, it is designed to be more comprehensive with respect to former employees. However, the best approach is a preventive one. By educating workers before they encounter a potentially hazardous substance, we can protect workers more successfully and at a lower cost.

I urge my colleagues to take a close look at this issue, and join us in supporting the legislation which we are introducing today.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE ACTION AGAINST LIBYA'S ABUSE OF DIPLOMATIC STATUS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the recent murder of a U.S. soldier in the Berlin disco bombing and the thwarted submachinegun and grenade attacks on the U.S. Embassy in Paris and the U.S. officer's club in Turkey had an important common characteristic; they were conducted by diplomatic personnel assigned to Libya's foreign embassies. Similarly, the Libyan Embassies in Rome and Vienna were used for logistic support for other Middle Eastern terrorists who conducted the murderous assault on the Rome and Vienna airports earlier this year. It is unlikely that these operations could have been carried out in the absence of Libya's ability to use the cover of its diplomatic status to conceal its campaign of terror. Indeed, evidence now exists which suggests that abuse of its diplomatic status abroad is the cornerstone of Libya's international terrorist activities. This should no longer be tolerated by the United States, and the means currently exist within existing international law and practice to stop it.

First, the United States should encourage its allies to close any Libyan diplomatic entity where its personnel have acted in support—direct or indirect—of terrorist activity. Diplomatic contact can still be maintained by establishing a Libyan interests section in another embassy in the affected country, but without the presence of the terrorists posing as diplomats.

Second, accreditation of any Libyan diplomat known to have been associated with terrorist activity should be denied anywhere in the world. This will require the cooperation of other nations—a process we should seek to influence. We have seen too often the practice of Libyan diplomats being expelled from one nation for terrorist activity simply continuing their murderous craft in another nation when they are reassigned to a new post.

Third, rights of transit or entry for Libyan diplomats associated with terrorist activity should be denied. This will limit the ability of Libyan diplomatic cover to be used for brief visits to facilitate terrorist operations in target nations.

Mr. Speaker, this week's summit meeting of the leaders of the Western World presages improved coordination and unity in the fight against terrorism. Building on that consensus, the time is ripe to take these minimal measures to end Libyan abuse of diplomatic status. The United States should place these efforts on the top of its diplomatic agenda when campaigning for effective antiterrorist action by allies and other friendly nations.

AMELIA BRASKIE HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, many generations of immigrants from around the world have contributed to the rich cultural diversity of our country, and I would like to take this opportunity to draw to your attention the accomplishments of one such immigrant who brought a bit of her homeland to America.

On Sunday, May 4, the Tirolesi Alpini of Hazleton, PA, honored their founder, Mrs. Amelia DeFant Braskie, at their 18th annual "Festa Tirolesa." It is a pleasure for me to join with this fine organization of Old World culture in commemorating Mrs. Braskie for her efforts in establishing Tirolesi Alpini.

In 1920 and at the age of 13, Amelia DeFant left her homeland of Taio, Val di Non, region of Trento Province (then a part of Austria) for America. Amelia, her six brothers and sisters, and her parents first settled in the small mining town of Anvil Location, MI. After 2 years in Michigan, the DeFants were drawn to Hazleton, PA, where many other Tiroleans worked in the heart of the anthracite coal region. They attended the first and only Tirolean Church in the United States, Our Lady of Mount Carmel, which is still in existence and is a Pennsylvania historical site.

Amelia married a baker, Walter S. Braskie, and had two children, Jean and Eileen. In 1968 she founded the nonprofit social organization Tirolesi Alpini of Hazleton, PA, to continue the Tirolean heritage she loved. Recognized by the Autonomous Province of Trento, the Tirolesi Alpini of Hazleton is in association with the "Greater Trentino" in North America, and is devoted to maintaining close ties with the people of Trento, Italy. Mrs. Braskie has acted as a liaison between the Tiroleans of the Old World and the New; fluent in her native tongue, she has visited her homeland on numerous occasions and introduced the government officials of the Autonomous Province of Trento to the Tiroleans in America.

The Tirolesi Alpini of Hazleton now has 500 members and is the host to the Seventh International Tirolean-Trentine Organization Convention this July 4, 5, and 6. The 17-year history of this organization is testimony to the enduring strength of the Tirolean heritage, and exemplifies the rich diversity of our American culture.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Amelia Braskie deserves our recognition of her outstanding contribution to the cultural life of our Nation, and I am pleased to bring her accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

HONDURANS AND COSTA RICANS FAVOR AID TO THE CONTRAS

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, we often hear that our Latin American friends do not favor U.S. support to the democratic Nicaraguan resistance. This assessment is wrong, as public opinion polls have repeatedly shown. Here's what the public in two Central American "frontline states"—Honduras and Costa Rica—have said: Nicaragua is the major threat to their future and democratic society; the Nicaraguan resistance should be supported and that Nicaragua would be better off with a victory by the resistance; and the United States is a positive force in Central America.

These findings were confirmed by a 1985 poll released earlier this year by our colleague, BOB LIVINGSTON. They were reconfirmed in a poll taken during the last 3 weeks of February by Gallup International's Costa Rican affiliate, Consultoria Interdisciplinaria en Desarrollo [CID]. Based on a representative sampling of 1,228 Costa Ricans and 1,200 Hondurans, the poll's major findings are:

Costa Ricans overwhelmingly favor U.S. military and financial aid to the anti-Sandinista Contra forces by a 50 to 11 percent margin, and Hondurans favor such aid by 57 to 10 percent. The rest have no opinion.

Six persons in ten in the survey countries think Nicaragua will be better off if the Contra forces win the conflict, and less than 2 in 10 favor victory by the Sandinista government. Over 6 in 10 say their own countries will be better off if the Contra forces win, and less than 1 in 10 disagrees.

Two-thirds of the Costa Rican public and half the Hondurans believe that the majority of the people in Nicaragua favor the Contra cause; 10 percent in Costa Rica and less than one-fifth in Honduras think that a majority in Nicaragua favors a Sandinista government victory.

More Costa Ricans, 57 percent, think the Contra forces treat people with consideration in the war zones than do the Sandinista government troops, 5 percent. One-quarter denies either side respects the people. In Honduras, while 4 in 10 say the Contra forces treat the people with more respect than the Sandinista forces, an equal number claims both sides demonstrate lack of respect for the populace; 1 in 10 speaks more highly of the Sandinistas than the Contras, and even fewer speak well of both.

Costa Ricans and Hondurans are far more inclined to believe a Contra victory would result in free elections and return to democracy than doubt this 51 to 9 percent in Costa

Rica, 57 to 6 percent in Honduras. The rest have no opinion.

An estimated 8 in every 10 Costa Ricans and Hondurans see Nicaragua acting as a tool of Cuba and the Soviet Union, not pursuing an independent policy.

**OPTIMIST INTERNATIONAL
PRESIDENT JAMES E. "JAY"
ATTARIAN HONORED**

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 through May 25, the Pacific Southwest District of Optimist International will be hosting their international president, James E. "Jay" Attarian and his wife Virginia.

Mr. Attarian has distinguished himself among those leaders who unselfishly dedicate their lives to the betterment of their nation and community. A veteran of the Korean war, Mr. Attarian is a highly respected member of the Woodland Hills, CA, business community where he is president of Jayson Realty Co. In 1962, Mr. Attarian joined the Optimist Club of Downtown Wilshire, CA, and has served the Optimists with distinction in various leadership positions until becoming international president in 1985.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the motto of the Optimist's is "Friend of Youth." For over 60 years now the Optimists have indeed been a friend of youth by sponsoring youth clubs, sporting events, community project awards, essay contests and many other important programs.

Through their many community programs, the Optimists successfully promote good citizenship, respect for law, and the giving of one's self in service to others to advance the well-being of man, his community and world.

It is with great honor and pride that I congratulate Mr. James Attarian for his leadership as president of Optimist International. And I congratulate Optimists everywhere for 67 years of distinguished service.

**NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF
COMPETITIVENESS**

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 18-20 Representative HOWARD WOLPE and I attended the National Conference on Competitiveness both as Members of Congress and in our capacity as co-chairs of the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition. The conference and the entire process leading up to it was a splendid example of what can be accomplished when we work closely with private-sector leaders on issues that face us as a nation.

I was impressed not only by the involvement of so many corporate and academic leaders in the process but also by the apparent commitment of the conference partici-

pants to see it through. Given the difficulty of the competitiveness problem, and the long period over which it has developed, we cannot expect instant success. However, through the coalition we will pursue those actions that can be taken by Congress to give American businesses and workers a better chance to compete on the world market. And we will coordinate our activities with the efforts of corporate and academic officials who have a vital stake in this issue.

I especially want to give credit to the members of the Business-Higher Education Forum who were instrumental in carrying out this project: Father Ted Hesburgh of Notre Dame, who chaired the forum in 1985, when we held our first meeting in Scottsdale, AZ, and our regional discussions; Ed Donley of Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., who is the forum's chair this year; Ruben Mettler of TRW, Inc., who co-chaired the steering committee for the conference; and Doug Danforth of Westinghouse, Bob Rosenzweig of the Association of American Universities; Frank Rhodes of Cornell, and David Saxon of MIT, who also served on the steering committee.

My greatest hope, Mr. Speaker, is that this unique joint effort will help us overcome the ideological and political differences that have divided us in so many areas related to competitiveness, and allow us to take steps that will better integrate our domestic and foreign economies.

**A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
NICK BETANCOURT**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, the Mexican-American Democratic Club will host a dinner in honor of Mr. Nick Betancourt for his many contributions to the community.

A native of California, Nick moved to San Pedro in 1928. Ten years later, he began 37 years of employment at Todd Shipyards. In concert with his work at the shipyard, Nick became a very active member of the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL-CIO, Local 9.

Nick is a cofounder and charter member of the Mexican-American Democratic Club and has been active in the League of United Latin American Clubs, Mexican-American Political Action, and the Harbor Area Political Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, Nick Betancourt has been a positive force in the Los Angeles Harbor Area for well over 50 years. His list of accomplishments following a lifetime of commitment to his family, his trade union, and the Democratic agenda is long and impressive. And many of the good things that have happened in our community over the years came into being through the involvement of dedicated volunteers and community activists like Nick Betancourt.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Nick Betancourt on this special occasion. He is truly deserving of this special recognition by the Mexican-American Democratic Club and we are lucky to have him as a member of our

community. We wish Nick and his wife, Clementina, and their children, Margaret, Trinidad, Tony, and Joe, continued success and happiness in all their future endeavors.

CHIEF ANGELINI HONORED

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take the opportunity today to bring to your attention the record of my constituent, William C. Angelini, who has been honored by his colleagues for his service as a member of the Gibbstown, NJ, Volunteer Fire Co.

Mr. Angelini has been a dedicated member of the fire company for 10 years and presently serves as chief. In this capacity as always, Mr. Angelini gives beyond that which is required.

His years of community service and in particular his tenure with the fire company are well worthy of recognition. His selfless and untiring efforts are illustrative of his dedication to the fire company and to improving the quality of life for the community of Gibbstown.

Certainly Mr. Angelini is worthy of our recognition, respect, and thanks for his work, rendered without compensation, in providing such a necessary and significant service to the community.

**SIMPLIFIED EMPLOYEE
PENSIONS**

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to simplify simplified employee pensions. These retirement savings vehicles function like employer-provided individual retirement accounts and are frequently attractive to small employers because they are relatively easy to administer.

Nevertheless, there are still some areas of the law which could be clarified to improve the administration of SEP's and to encourage more employers to put them in place. This bill would provide that employees would no longer have to take into income the amounts contributed to a SEP on their behalf and then exclude that amount on their tax returns. This new provision would mean that SEP contributions were essentially treated the same as other pension contributions.

In addition, the employer contribution to a SEP could be made on the basis of the employer's fiscal year rather than in relation to the calendar year ending within the employer's fiscal year. Likewise, the requirement that the SEP cover employees who have worked for the employer in 3 of the last 5 calendar years would be modified to apply on the basis of either the calendar year or the employer's fiscal year, with the requirement that this would be applied consistently. Finally, under current law, employers are not required to

make SEP contributions for employees who earn \$200 or less in a particular year. This bill would increase the de minimis provision to \$300 and index it for inflation.

SEP's have the potential to fill some of the gaps in the current private pension system because of how well they can fit the needs of small businesses. I hope that by making simplified plans simpler we can encourage their establishment and help provide more meaningful retirement security to workers not currently benefiting from the private pension system.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN HOULIHAN

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, recently John Houlihan, for many years a widely known and respected resident of Will County, IL, retired from the Washington headquarters of the Veterans' Administration after 8 years of distinguished service. He filled the difficult position of program analyst in that enormous organization which is of such immense importance to all American veterans. He has other extraordinary credits, not the least of which include chairmanship of the Democratic Party of Will County for a considerable period of time and a member of our State legislature in the late sixties and early seventies.

It must be noted that he distinguished himself in the Marine Corps during World War II, suffering the enormous loss of a limb in the fierce island warfare we had with the Japanese in 1944.

One can say many things about John, and I know of nothing unfavorable. He is highly intelligent, completely honest, and has a tremendous sense of fair play no matter with whom he is dealing. Like his many friends in Joliet and Will County, I am happy that he's coming back home, as he can only be a credit to the community in which he resides.

I know my colleagues in the House join me in wishing John Houlihan continued success in the future.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO CALIFORNIA-ASIAN PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE WEEK

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a very special celebration in my home State of California-Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Week. Gov. George Deukmejian has set aside May 4-10, 1986, to celebrate the rich and diverse Asian Pacific cultures that have contributed to this great State.

In addition to memorializing the history and contributions of the Asian Pacific communities in our State, Heritage Week will serve to promote a greater understanding of the contem-

porary needs and concerns of the Asian Pacific peoples in American society.

Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Week is celebrated annually on the national, State and local community levels. In an effort to commemorate this event in a meaningful way, a broad-based ad hoc committee has been established to plan events that will enrich Americans of all ethnic backgrounds. This year's Heritage Week will include exhibits, speeches, and a film series—all created to enhance American awareness of Asian Pacific Islander culture.

Clearly, Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Week will be both fun and entertaining. Even more importantly, however, it will serve to create understanding and appreciation between diverse American cultures.

Mr. Speaker, I highly commend Ida Tsujikawa and Judie Miyao, cochairpersons for this year's Heritage Week, for the magnificent job they have done in organizing this enlightening and educational event. On behalf of the people of Sacramento, I thank those who have made this event possible and wish Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Week every success.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARE

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues the 40th anniversary of CARE, which is being recognized by my home State of South Dakota during the week of May 11-17, 1986.

CARE was created 40 years ago because of the conviction of many religious, service, and cooperative organizations that a people-to-people approach was required to assist war-torn Europe. Today, CARE, a cooperative organization owned by 23 national, economic, religious and ethnic organizations, is the largest private, voluntary, relief and development organization in the world.

CARE is continuing to meet the needs of as many as 40 million people in 35 countries around the world. For their good works, commitment to personal attention, and assistance to those in need, I commend CARE and wish them many productive years ahead.

Finally, there are a number of States in addition to South Dakota which are celebrating CARE week. They include Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, and South Carolina.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. ANTHONY DELUCA

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention a lifesaving act of mercy undertaken by one of my constituents. Mr. Anthony DeLuca was at home on December 10,

1985, when his 8-year-old brother, Michael, began to choke on a piece of food. Upon realizing his brother could not breathe, Anthony began a sequence of first aid maneuvers to open the obstructed airway. His actions, without doubt, saved his brother's life.

Mr. DeLuca who has trained in Red Cross CPR, has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit and accompanying pin. This is the highest award given by the American Red Cross to a person who saves or sustains life using skills and knowledge learned in a volunteer training program offered by the Red Cross.

The presentation of the award is taking place May 12, 1986, at the Raritan Valley American Red Cross Chapter annual dinner in Bridgewater, NJ. I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of this body to congratulate and thank Anthony DeLuca for this act of bravery and the care and concern for humanity which it represents.

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1986

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, memory is a gift of intellect in each human being—but sadly some of our remembrances are sorrowful. But the memory cannot be halted—it cannot be told to forget or ignore.

And during the current week we observe Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust during World War II. As successive generations move farther away from the atrocities of World War II, the memory can only grasp the significance of the Jewish Holocaust in the context of a historical teaching. But in that history and its recollection, we learn about ourselves and prepare for a better future.

Today I join my colleagues in acknowledging not just the suffering of the 6 million during World War II, but the hope that through growth there is a measure of perfection attained by humankind and never again will such misery be inflicted by one person against another.

DONALD F. MORTON, SAVINGS AND LOAN HEAD, HONORED

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Donald F. Morton, chairman and president of Arlington Federal Savings & Loan, was recently honored by officers and staff to commemorate his 30th year of leadership. Unique in the northwest suburbs, Arlington Federal is the only financial institution still governed and led by the original management. Mr. Morton is an exemplary American, involved and active in national and local affairs. A respected gentleman who has led AFS through the past turbulence and has brought his institution to a high of \$400

million in assets. He is a man who honors his wife, is devoted to his family, who drives his grandson to school every morning, and has always recognized and promoted women to officer status. He is a respected leader who speaks softly and uses his power wisely and gently. He is a close personal friend upon whose board I have served in the past. In this capacity I came to recognize the unique qualities of this truly unusual man.

SALUTE TO PAULINE FRIEDMAN

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1986

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 13, 1986, Temple Oheb Shalom in Reading, PA, will be holding a special service to celebrate the 90th birthday of Mrs. Pauline Friedman.

In addition to the birthday celebration, the congregation will also be honoring Mrs. Friedman's 60 years of service to Temple Oheb Shalom. She has been a leader in many local organizations and has dedicated her life to the Temple. Her many years of hard work have paid off as the Temple continues to grow and flourish. Pauline Friedman's life has been devoted to selfless community service and she provides us with an example which all should try to emulate. I know that my colleagues will want to join me in wishing her a happy 90th birthday as well as continued success and good fortune in the years to come.

ENFORCE FAIR TRADE LAWS

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress begins its consideration of the omnibus trade bill next week, one of the major topics of discussion will be how we can deal more effectively with nations that engage in unfair trading practices.

I am a supporter of the concept of free trade. But I also believe that trade should be fair as well. And when there is incontrovertible evidence that U.S. industries have been harmed by nations that play by different trading rules, we have to be prepared to take swift and effective action to stop the practice.

Today I am introducing legislation concerning a specific case of unfair trading practices. And on another front, I'm joining with Congressman MICA in addressing ways to encourage foreign nations to play more fairly in the international marketplace.

BREAKING THE IMPASSE ON THE U.S. SEMICONDUCTOR INDUSTRY CASE

Almost 1 year ago the Semiconductor Industry Association presented evidence to the United States Trade Representative that the Government of Japan had denied United

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

States companies full access to their markets. In doing so, they asked the President to take action to eliminate those barriers pursuant to section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974.

In response to these charges, the administration initiated a formal investigation. At this time, the U.S. Government has not officially determined whether or not the charges made by the semiconductor industry are, in fact, true. If such an affirmative finding were made, however, the President would then have to decide whether or not to take reciprocal action against that nation.

I have been following this case very close since its inception. I have continued to write letters encouraging both the Japanese and United States Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter to resolve this important issue. I have been a member of an informal working group of Senators and Members of Congress organized to keep pressure on both parties to resolve this case. And just a few weeks ago I had the opportunity to discuss this matter face to face with Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone while he was visiting Washington, DC.

Personally, I would rather not see the President have to resort to retaliatory action against our friends in Japan. Retaliation is counterproductive and only invites further retaliation.

I would rather see the United States and Japan reach an agreement whereby Japan would expand their markets to our semiconductor industry. And, in fact, there was reason to believe that such an agreement was possible when the United States and Japan immediately entered into negotiations after the filing of this petition.

But progress on the talks has been extremely slow. And now it seems that the discussions have actually reached an impasse.

This stalemate is counterproductive for all the parties involved. But I'm especially concerned that the breakdown of the negotiations will only add more uncertainty to an already confusing and tenuous economic situation the semiconductor industry finds itself in today.

This industry has been under siege. The Department of Commerce has made a preliminary finding that Japanese firms have been dumping semiconductor chips in this country. At the same time they've been denied substantial access to Japanese markets. Eight thousand jobs in Oregon and over a hundred thousand others across this country are threatened by failure to implement remedies to this situation.

It is time now to try to break the logjam.

Today I am introducing a sense of the House resolution that encourages the Governments of the United States and Japan to once and for all resolve this issue.

My resolution does two things:

It calls upon the Government of Japan to guarantee full and substantial access to their markets for the United States semiconductor industry. There's no reason why our friends shouldn't grant U.S. businesses the same access we grant them. It makes no sense that one-third of the United States trade deficit is with the Japanese. There is absolutely no reason why exporters of our products should be hitting a brick wall once they cross the Pacific Ocean.

It also directs the President to immediately determine if the complaints made by the Semiconductor Industry Association are true and whether Japan's actions constitute "unfair trade" under section 301 of our trade laws. Once such a determination is made, the President would then have the option of ordering reciprocal action by the United States.

In other words, let's fish or cut bait.

The 8,000 workers in the State of Oregon employed by the semiconductor industry are anxious to see a resolution to this problem. They deserve a resolution to this problem.

Theirs is an industry that is absolutely vital to our national security. The United States semiconductor industry is a world leader in new and advanced technologies and has demonstrated its competitiveness in all markets to which it has had free access. But they've been working hard to recover from some hard financial times. In Oregon alone, one manufacturer of semiconductor chips had to recently lay off 800 workers in my district. To the extent that unfair trading practices of other nations have contributed to those economic woes, they deserve to have someone in the U.S. Government to go to bat for them.

We put these laws, such as section 301 actions, on the books for a reason. And that was to give us a tool to enforce fair trade. We better make these laws work or else the protectionist fervor is going to take over and I believe that would spell disaster, ultimately, for U.S. exporters.

I am introducing this resolution today because I don't trust the machinery of government to move as fast as it should when it comes to responding to unfair trading practices. There have been cases in the past where the pleas for relief from unfair trade practices have gone unanswered in Washington for too long. In fact, the U.S. semiconductor industry is involved in another unresolved case involving the dumping of certain semiconductor chips—and some companies have, in the interim, closed down their operations on those products.

Mr. Speaker, this is not protectionism. When other nations do not let us compete on a level playing field, my patience starts to wear thin. It reaches a boiling point when our own Government fails to vigorously pursue remedies to provide safeguards against those unfair trading practices.

One important note: This resolution does not call upon the President to retaliate. It is merely meant to force a final solution to a problem that has affected the semiconductor industry for years. This at least will give the semiconductor industry some sense of what the future holds.

The clock is running out on this. It's time for action. Either Japan and the United States must reach an accommodable solution to this problem, or the United States must take official action.

That's what my resolution seeks to accomplish.

I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution and join me in sending a strong message to the Governments of Japan and the United States.

PRYING FOREIGN MARKETS OPEN

In mid-March the United States Department of Commerce issued a preliminary finding that several Japanese companies had been dumping certain semiconductor chips in the United States. This decision found that the margin of dumping semiconductors onto U.S. markets had ranged up to 188 percent.

But under current law, Commerce's findings do nothing for the companies that are actually harmed by the practices. That's because current antidumping laws do not allow financial compensation to go to the U.S. companies which have been injured. Instead, the money goes into the U.S. Treasury.

What happens, therefore, is that a U.S. company might win their case, but they could still go out of business because they haven't gotten compensation.

Meanwhile, foreign companies that have been found to dump products in the United States can come back time and time again. In other words, there is no punishment for repeat offenders.

I recently cosponsored legislation that addresses both of these problems.

This bill establishes a mechanism whereby foreign producers found to have engaged in dumping which caused injury to U.S. companies would be assessed damages that would be payable to the U.S. Treasury, but which U.S. firms could recover through U.S. district court action. That will ensure an opportunity for the victims of unfair trading practices to seek compensation.

This bill also sets up a "three strikes and you're out" scheme whereby firms found to have engaged in dumping in the U.S. market on three or more occasions would be excluded from the U.S. market for 5 years. There's a point where you have to say "enough is enough". Repeat offenders should not be given the privilege of having full access to our open markets.

GILLIS W. LONG POST OFFICE BUILDING

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, the Louisiana delegation has introduced legislation, H.R. 4782, to honor our late friend and colleague, Gillis W. Long. Our bill proposes to name in his honor the U.S. Post Office at LaPlace, LA, which is under construction now.

For Gillis, who did so much for the Eighth Congressional District, for his State, Louisiana, for the House, and for this Nation, this is a fitting memorial. One of the most meaningful tributes which can be paid to individuals is to cherish their memory after they are gone. Through words and deeds, we are able to remember them.

Gillis always served with distinction, in all his endeavors and pursuits. In recognition of his service, in remembrance of his distinguished career, and in memory of him as a U.S. Representative from Louisiana's Eighth Congressional District, the Louisiana delegation proposes, therefore, to remember Gillis

W. Long by dedicating a public building in his name.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the 99th Congress, many of us gathered in the House Chamber to speak in memory of Gillis. As you stated then, his "memory lives on in our minds, in our hearts and in our enduring respect and admiration for him and what he stood for." Our legislation will allow for a public and visible testimony to Gillis, demonstrating our enduring respect and admiration.

Gillis Long had a life filled with achievement. One of his most outstanding achievements is that the people he served and with whom he worked remember him. Naming this public building in his honor will enable us to perpetuate his memory.

We also have all been fortunate to have served with our colleague, Representative CATHY LONG, who has succeeded Gillis and continued his fine tradition of service to people throughout the Nation and the State. We are pleased to have her join with us in support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that legislation which we have introduced will be acted on expeditiously and we welcome our colleagues to join us in support and cosponsorship of the bill.

PUBLIC SERVICE CAREER

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to pay tribute to my constituent, Mary Mautner. Ms. Mautner is retiring from public service after serving the State of Michigan and the city of Detroit for over 40 years.

In 1941, Ms. Mautner joined the Wayne County Bureau of Social Aid where she provided assistance to ADC families. She became a nonsettlement worker for the department of public welfare in 1947 where she remained until 1966. Ms. Mautner then began working as a resource consultant, handling investigations of insurance, workers compensation and unemployment claims. In 1968, she became a special investigator and assisted State auditors in conducting various audits, the collection of welfare payments, and handling claims for Social Security, serving as a liaison for the agency. She joined the missing warrant unit in 1979 to investigate stolen and missing ADC and GA warrants.

Ms. Mautner began working with the Community Work Experience Training Program in 1980, assigning clients to work sites and monitoring those work sites. She will retire from the contract management unit of the department of social services. Throughout her years of service with the DSS, she has worked to improve the system, and to directly benefit those in need. Her record of public service is commendable, and I wish to congratulate

Mary Mautner and wish her a happy, healthy retirement.

CONNECTICUT AWARDED \$6.5 MILLION TO ESTABLISH CANCER CONTROL RESEARCH UNIT

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the creation of the Cancer Control Research Unit for Connecticut at Yale University represents a landmark in the fight against cancer, not only for the people of Connecticut but for all Americans.

The program is being funded by a \$6.5 million grant from the National Cancer Institute. Connecticut is only the second State to receive such a grant, attesting to the standard of excellence achieved by the medical community in our State.

The agencies participating in the new Cancer Control Research Unit include the Yale Comprehensive Cancer Center, the State of Connecticut Department of Health Services, the University of Connecticut Health Center, and the Department of Epidemiology and Public Health of the Yale University School of Medicine. Also associated with this effort are the Connecticut Hospital Association, the Connecticut State Medical Society, the Connecticut Division of the American Cancer Society, and the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

The Yale Comprehensive Cancer Center is one of 20 nationally designated comprehensive cancer centers in the United States. The University of Connecticut's Health Center is one of 30 leading cancer programs in the Nation that comprise the Children's Cancer Study Group. The Connecticut Tumor Registry is the oldest population-based tumor registry in the world, and will be a major asset to the new unit. Dr. Dwight T. Janerich, professor of epidemiology and public health at the Yale University School of Medicine, will be directing the new Cancer Control Research Unit.

The program will have seven major projects: First, improving early detection of cervical cancer, two, decreasing use of smokeless tobacco, third, effects of race and social factors on stage at diagnosis, fourth, interventions to improve use of breast cancer screening, fifth, case-control study of lethal melanoma and skin examinations, sixth, microbial and biochemical predictors of colorectal carcinoma, and seventh, a paired-community approach to colorectal cancer control. These projects are exemplary in that they explore the potential of earlier diagnosis and prevention in cancer management. The establishment of the new cancer control research unit is a great honor for Connecticut and another step forward in the fight to prevent and cure cancer.

OLDER AMERICANS' MONTH

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since May 1986 is Older Americans' Month, I would like to take this opportunity to express my concern over administration reports and rumors that the elderly of America are no longer a disadvantaged segment of our society.

It is true that there are many well-off older people. But it is also true that there are many more who live in or very near poverty. Social Security and other Federal programs have been successful in drastically reducing poverty among the elderly. However, it is these very same programs that critics now wish to eliminate or cut, once again threatening the income security of the elderly.

Older women, mostly widows, make up 71 percent of the elderly poor. Only 23 percent of older women receive both Social Security and a private pension. I contacted the Census Bureau and was informed that for the year 1984, the median income for women over 65, who were on Social Security or other pensions, was \$6,131—which is less than \$900 over the poverty line of \$5,250.

The elderly are particularly susceptible to inflation. The rising cost of health care places much more of burden on the elderly, who need medical care more than most younger citizens. As of this year, for example, Medicare patients will be paying \$492 for their first day's stay in the hospital. That is an increase of 23 percent from the 1985 rate. Out-of-pocket health care costs for the elderly have risen at the rate of 11.4 percent per year since 1980. With only a average 3.5 percent Social Security cost-of-living-allowance, the elderly are out 8 percent annually. While the majority of Americans are now benefiting from lower gasoline prices, which has a direct bearing on the consumer, how many senior citizens even drive. Have you seen a decrease in taxi or transit fares? I have not!

We must be optimistic that we do live in the greatest country in the world, but we must not lose sight of the fact that our country is the greatest because of the contributions of those people who are no longer young. We cannot rose-color the fact that our elderly need the help of those of us here in Congress to ensure that they can live out their retirement years in a dignity which they so richly deserve.

THE GOVERNMENT IS ABOUT TO LOSE ONE OF ITS OUTSTANDING SERVANTS

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government is about to lose one of its most outstanding employees. Time marches on and retirement looms for Joseph F. Friedkin, who, after having served nearly 24 years as U.S.

Commissioner of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, leaves today for justifiable peace and quiet.

His history with the IBWC spans 52 years beginning in 1934 when he joined the U.S. section of the Commission as a career employee. He served with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in World War II, and in 1947, he resumed his employment with the IBWC as its resident engineer in San Diego, CA. Then, in 1952, he became the section's principal engineer at the supervising headquarters office in El Paso, TX, a position second only to the Commissioner. It was in April 1962 that President Kennedy appointed him Commissioner of the IBWC, an appointment confirmed upon him by each of the five subsequent administrations.

As head administrator of the United States and Mexico International Boundary and Water Commission's U.S. Section, Commissioner Friedkin has worked tirelessly in carrying out a broad program of engineering objectives for the solution of water and boundary problems arising along the 1,900-mile border with Mexico. He is largely responsible for bringing to fruition over 50 international agreements with Mexico; among them, the design and execution of the Chamizal Boundary Settlement, the Falcon and Amistad Dams, powerplants on the Rio Grande, flood control improvement measures, the 1970 Boundary Treaty, and treatment solutions for border sanitation and water pollution problems.

To his position, Commissioner Friedkin brought vigor, dedication, and diplomacy. He was instrumental in improving not only the economic well-being of the peoples living on either side of the United States-Mexico border, but in cultivating social ties as well. President Johnson, in 1968, so noted Commissioner Friedkin's diplomatic skills by according him the personal rank of ambassador.

If Commissioner Friedkin's achievements were measured in terms of the number of lives he has enhanced from an environmental standpoint, the accounting would be endless. Today, thousands of people of either side of the United States-Mexico border lead healthier lives thanks to the strides made by the IBWC in protecting the lands of the two countries. These were projects promoted and brought to fruition by Commissioner Friedkin.

Although Commissioner Friedkin will be gone from the IBWC shortly, his many works will remain as a testament to his leadership. I hope the future holds for him the same success and rewards as the past has provided. He will be sorely missed. Speaking personally, I shall be deprived of his counsel, his direction, his boundless enthusiasm, and the ability he had to project his faith and his confidence into every undertaking.

MADISON HEIGHTS LAMPHERE SUPERINTENDENT RETIRES

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to the Lamphere

Schools Superintendent Frank A. Agnello. Superintendent Agnello is retiring after 26 years in the field of education.

A native of Pennsylvania, he served in the U.S. Army and was discharged in 1948. Following military service, he attended Indiana University. After graduation, he came to Michigan and began his career as a classroom teacher in Garden City. In 1957, he joined the Ferndale School District and continued teaching there until 1960 when he began his tenure with the Lamphere Schools as a teacher. In 1963, he became the principal of an elementary school and was named administrative assistant of the Lamphere District in 1968. Frank was selected to serve as superintendent in 1978 and has responded to the challenge with innovative ideas, dedication to the quality of education for all students, and concern for the future of public education.

On June 16, the Lamphere School District will honor Superintendent Agnello for his outstanding years of service and dedication to the welfare and education of our children and youth. I have had the privilege of knowing Frank Agnello for over 20 years and I congratulate him on his exemplary career, and wish him a happy and healthy retirement.

CELEBRATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST CONDOMINIUM CONVERSION

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, two decades ago, a group of men and women took advantage of a new idea in American real estate by completing the first condominium conversion in the United States. Now, as the residents of this building prepare to celebrate its 20th anniversary, they can look back proudly at having set the standard that all other real estate conversions would do well to emulate.

This historic building is located at 9410 64th Road, in Rego Park, Queens County, NY. Its residents have had true success by allowing tenants a real choice; in fact, one tenant who decided not to buy his apartment lived on under rent control protection for almost 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, in the story of this modest structure in Rego Park and of the creative people who transformed it, I think we can see a truly American spirit of inventiveness and the can-do ethic. It is precisely this kind of innovation to meet challenges that has allowed this Nation to sustain such a tremendous history of growth.

As always, it was the people involved in this enterprise who made the difference. David Wolfenson was the landlord of the building 20 years ago; it was his initiative that started the entire process. Edward Schiff gave the expert legal advice necessary to complete the project; 20 years later, he still represents both sponsors and tenants groups.

Mr. Speaker, I call now on all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the men and women of 9410 64th Road on the 20th anni-

versary of their successful conversion, and in wishing them the best of luck for the future.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1986, marked the 71st anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-23. By the time the genocide ended, 1.5 million men, women and children, nearly one-half of the world's Armenian population, had been slaughtered in their ancestral homeland. In the 71 years since the massacre by the Ottoman Turkish Government, we have seen the Armenians continue their struggle to escape persecution. The contributions to society by the Armenian people, in America and elsewhere, are a testimony to the resiliency and determination of the human spirit.

There are those who deny that the genocide of the Armenians occurred, in the belief that such an admission will give justification for terrorist attacks against Turkish Government officials. While I in no way support terrorist's actions, I feel this fear is unjustified.

The attacks, to the best of my understanding, are not an attempt to avenge the atrocities of 71 years ago. They are, instead, borne out of frustration due to the present Turkish Government's refusal to acknowledge the genocide committed by their predecessors. It is this denial which has prompted the terrorist attacks. The Armenians do not want revenge, they simply ask that the Turkish Government admit that the genocide occurred, just as present-day Germany has admitted the crimes of Nazi Germany against the Jews. By admitting to the genocide, Turkey will avoid further bloodshed.

Even as we strive toward the prevention of mass human destruction, we must not forget or deny the horrors of the past. George Santayana, in 1905, wrote: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." The massacre of the Armenians was the 20 century's first act of genocide, but unfortunately not the last. Stalin's slaughter of millions of Russians, the horrors of the Nazi Holocaust and Pol Pot's massacre of Cambodians offer mute evidence to the price of ignorance. It is a price we cannot afford to pay.

So long as the people of Earth continue to discriminate against one another based on differences in race, religion or politics, the potential for such atrocities remains. We may forgive but we must not forget.

VETERAN FERNDALE OFFICER RETIRES

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1986

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I offer my congratulations to Detective Dan R. Bolen on the occasion of his retirement from the Ferndale Police Department. Detective Bolen has given 30 years of his life to public service as a law enforcement officer.

Dan Bolen is a lifelong resident of the city of Ferndale, taking time away to serve in the U.S. Air Force from 1951 to 1955. He joined the police force in November 1955, was promoted to the rank of detective in 1969, and retired late last year. On May 17, the Ferndale Police Department will honor Detective Bolen at a testimonial dinner to thank him for his years of service and celebrate his outstanding career.

I extend my best wishes to Dan Bolen; his wife, Margaret; and their children, Jeffrey, Alan, and Eric on this special occasion; and a hearty "well done" to Detective Bolen. May he enjoy a healthy and happy retirement.